VOLUME XXXVI No. 1

The Catholic Historical Review

ALOYSIUS K. ZIEGLER MARTIN R. P. McGUIRE
JOHN TRACY ELLIS
Managing Editor

ADVISORY EDITORS

MANOEL S. CARDOZO PAUL KINIERY ROBERT F. McNAMARA
WILLIAM L. DAVIS THOMAS T. McAVOY JOSEPH N. MOODY

Table of Contents

APRIL, 1950

ARTICLE

Background of the 1902 Taft Mission to Rome. I. *John T. Farrell* 1

MISCELLANY

The Thirtieth Annual Meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association, Boston, December 28-30, 1949. 33

The Need for the Study of American Church History. *Richard J. Cushing* 43

The Historian in the Service of Peace. *John J. Wright* 47

BOOK REVIEWS 52

NOTES AND COMMENTS 107

PERIODICAL LITERATURE 116

BOOKS RECEIVED 123

BOOK REVIEWS

The History of the Primitive Church. (Jules Lebreton, S.J. and Jacques Zeiller). FRANCIS GLIMM 52
The Photian Schism: History and Legend. (Francis Dvornik). MARTIN J. HIGGINS 53
Studi Gregoriani. Volume III. (G. Borino). STEPHEN MCKENNA 57
Henry VIII and the Reformation. (H. Maynard Smith). HARRY C. KOENIG 58
Storia dell' introduzione del cristianesimo in Cina. (Pasquale M. D'Elia, S.J.). GEORGE H. DUNNE 60
Louis XIV contre Innocent XI. Les appels au futur concile de 1688 et l'opinion française. (Jean Orcibal). EDWARD A. RYAN 61
Apostolic Legations to China of the Eighteenth Century. (Antonio Sisto Rosso, O.F.M.). SCHUYLER V. R. CAMMANN 62
Gregorio XVI. Miscellanea Commemorativa. Two Volumes. WILLIAM J. COLEMAN 63
Le Secret de Junipero Serra. Fondateur de la Californie-Nouvelle, 1769-1784. (Charles J. G. Maximin Piette, O.F.M.). Two Volumes. PETER MASTEN DUNNE 65
Religion and Education under the Constitution. (J. M. O'Neill). WILLIAM E. MCMANUS 69
The History of the Sisters of Providence of Saint Mary-of-the-Woods. Volume I. (Sister Mary Borromeo Brown). SISTER M. ROSALITA KELLY 70
The Catholic University of America, 1887-1896. The Rectorship of John J. Keane. (Patrick H. Ahern). *The Catholic University of America, 1896-1903. The Rectorship of Thomas J. Conaty.* (Peter E. Hogan, S.S.J.). JOSEPH MCSORLEY 71
Meaning in History. The Theological Implications of the Philosophy of History. (Karl Löwith). GEORGE B. FLAHIFF 73
Michelangelo: The Medici Chapel. (Charles de Tolnay). JOHN K. CARTWRIGHT 74
South Africa under King Sebastian and the Cardinal, 1557-1580. (Sydney R. Welch). JUSTUS M. VAN DER KROEF 76
Francis the Good. The Education of an Emperor, 1768-1792. (Walter Consuelo Langsam). MARY LUCILLE SHAY 77
Westward Expansion. A History of the American Frontier. (Ray Allen Billington and James B. Hedges). PAUL KINIERY 78
Characteristically American. (Ralph Barton Perry). ANTHONY H. DEYE 79
This Was America. (Oscar Handlin). ANNABELLE M. MELVILLE 80
The Negro in the United States. (E. Franklin Frazier). JOHN PERRY PRITCHETT 83
The Southern Colonies in the Seventeenth Century, 1607-1689. (Wesley Frank Craven). WILLIAM J. FLETCHER 84
Father Knickerbocker Rebels. New York City during the Revolution. (Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker). ANNABELLE M. MELVILLE 86
American Tobacco and Central European Policy: Early Nineteenth Century. (Sister Mary Anthonita Hess). EVELENE PETERS 88
John Quincy Adams and the Foundations of American Foreign Policy. (Samuel Flagg Bemis). JOHN T. FARRELL 89
Immigrant Life in New York City, 1825-1863. (Robert Ernst). JOSEPH G. DWYER 91

Rock of Chickamauga: The Life of General George H. Thomas. (Freeman Cleaves). P. RAYMOND NIELSON 92
The University of Wisconsin: A History, 1848-1925. (Merle Curti and Vernon Carstensen). Two Volumes. PETER LEO JOHNSON 93
Labor in America. A History. (Foster Rhea Dulles). HENRY J. BROWNE 96
Protestant Churches and Industrial America. (Henry F. May). JAMES EDMUND ROOHAN 97
American Social Reform Movements. Their Pattern Since 1865. (Thomas H. Greer). JAMES EDMUND ROOHAN 98
Labor Relations in the New York Rapid Transit Systems, 1904-1944. (James J. McGinley, S.J.). THOMAS J. DARBY 99
The Spanish Struggle for Justice in the Conquest of America. (Lewis Hanke). JOHN FRANCIS BANNON 100
The Audiencia of New Galicia in the Sixteenth Century. A Study in Spanish Colonial Government. (J. H. Parry). FRANCIS BORGIA STECK 102
The Mining Guild of New Spain and Its Tribunal General, 1770-1821. (Walter Howe). THOMAS E. DOWNEY 104
Simón Bolívar. (Gerhard Masur). W. EUGENE SHIELDS 105

The Catholic Historical Review

Volume XXXVI APRIL, 1950 No. 1

BACKGROUND OF THE 1902 TAFT MISSION TO ROME. I.

By

JOHN T. FARRELL*

The Philippine Insurrection, which cost the United States a thousand lives and $170,000,000, was an embarrassing aftermath to the acceptance of title to that archipelago in the Treaty of Paris which concluded the Spanish American War in 1898. An unexpected consequence of the new venture in Manifest Destiny, the task of subduing Aguinaldo's nationalist army, put the United States in the place of the Spaniards, whose regime in Cuba had provoked the war in the first place. A display of force, and the re-election of McKinley in 1900 on a Republican platform of avowed imperialism, served to convince the Filipinos that the Americans were in the Islands to stay indefinitely; but force might have been required upon an even larger scale, and the testing of American determination carried much farther, had it not become American policy to accommodate the Filipino politicians by such concessions as would enable them to accept American sovereignty as a desirable alternative to guerrilla warfare.[1]

* Mr. Farrell is associate professor of American history in the Catholic University of America.

[1] The essential facts of the American entry into the Philippines are to be found in Samuel Flagg Bemis, *A Diplomatic History of the United States* (New York, 1942), p. 473. More extensive accounts are Dean C. Worcester, *The Philippines Past and Present*, 2 Vols. (New York, 1914), James H. Blount, *The American Occupation of the Philippines* (New York, 1913), and W. Cameron Forbes, *The Philippine Islands*, 2 Vols. (Boston, 1928). For the period up to 1900 the greatest amount of detail is in James A. LeRoy, *The Americans in the Philippines*, 2 Vols. (Boston, 1914); and a special treatment of the work of the Taft Commission is in Henry F. Pringle, *The Life and Times of William Howard Taft*, 2 Vols. (New York, 1939), I, 154. Pringle

The concessions amounted to a practical recognition of earlier native grievances against Spanish rule, and a promise to eschew any course reminiscent of that era. The most notable grievance, one for which the American rulers had to promise a thorough remedy, if they were to win over a sufficient number of Filipino *ilustrados,* was the dominant position maintained by the Spanish clergy in the Islands, a clergy made up for the most part of members of one or another of the four largest missionary orders there: Dominicans, Franciscans, Augustinian Hermits, and Augustinian Recollects.

Established in most of the parishes, the friars[2] had never been replaced by a native clergy, after more than 300 years of missionary activity. By the circumstances of inadequate Spanish civil rule of the Islands they had born a major part of the burden of upholding that rule, yet, at the same time, they were frequently in difficulty with civil officials who represented home governments not too friendly to the orders. Their security lay in their rich endowments, property which, besides schools and hospitals, was estimated to include one fifteenth of the arable land; on the other hand, this security made

---

is sardonic in his treatment of what concerns this article; Forbes is irenic, but Blount, LeRoy, and Worcester give spirited and rather partisan accounts.

[2] Every work which treats to any extent of the American occupation and early government in the Philippines gives some attention to the religious confusion which prevailed at the end of the Spanish rule; they also present some discussion of the specific problem of the friars. The well written discussion in Donald Dean Parker, "Church and State in the Philippines, 1896-1906," (Ms. dissertation, University of Chicago Divinity School, 1936) was very considerately made available to the writer, who is very much indebted to that author for the most detailed references to the literature of the period and to all relevant United States Government documents. It has a great deal to offer on the background of the nationalist fever, which in religion produced the Aglipayan Independent Church, and while the account given is partial to the Protestant missions this in no way diminishes its general usefulness. Dr. Parker has done a great deal to restore the religious issues of the time to a central position in the story of the American occupation. The broader treatments mentioned above show the authors' great desire to minimize controversial religious matters—a reflection of the good intentions of even most bitter partisans to restrict discussions of this aspect of American imperialism to political and economic levels. Parker relies heavily for his treatment of the friar problem upon James A. LeRoy, "The Friars in the Philippines," *Political Science Quarterly,* XVIII (December, 1903), 657-680, and Charles H. Cunningham, "Origin of the Friar Lands Question in the Philippines," *American Political Science Review,* X (August, 1916), 465-480. Other references are given on occasion below.

them the target of every critic of *latifundia*. Of course the friars had long been the principal spoilers of the machinations of separatist politicians. Now, under the Treaty of Paris the Church, and in particular these religious, were as secure in their parochial and property rights as any international legislation could make them — but it would prove to be no less embarrassing to the United States to deal with this implied 'union of Church and State' than it was embarrassing to suppress an independence movement. The repudiation of the one proved to be the key to an adjustment of the other: To satisfy the Filipino leaders that "religious liberty, fundamental personal rights, and the largest practicable measure of home rule," would be the prime objectives of the United States *imperium*, the friars had to be eliminated.[3] The endeavor of the first and second Philippine Commissions and the War Department to achieve the removal of the friars with a minimum of religious and political disturbance, led to the novelty of an American mission to the Vatican in 1902. In the background of this, one of the most delicate of the tasks undertaken by William Howard Taft for his chief, Theodore Roosevelt, are to be found the promptings of Taft's Cincinnati friends, the Bellamy Storers, and the well intentioned efforts of the Archbishop of St. Paul, John Ireland, to be useful to the Church and to the McKinley and Roosevelt administrations.

Archbishop Ireland had emerged from his brief diplomatic career in the spring of 1898 without acquiring a reputation for discreet and able mediation between Rome and Washington. There had been rather a disappointing outcome to the whole business, not entirely his fault, but leading to a certain caution on the part of the McKinley administration in dealing with him, and working clearly to his disadvantage in Rome, where his communications had supposedly given the Vatican a false understanding of the possibilities of averting war between

[3] "The very thing they yearn for is what of all others our government will naturally desire to give them—religious liberty, fundamental personal rights, and the largest practicable measure of home rule." *Report of the Philippine Commission to the President, Jan. 31, 1900* (Washington, 1900), I, 85. The development of this theme will be the work of more than the present article. Useful manuscript material will be found for this purpose in the Taft, Root, and Roosevelt Papers in the Library of Congress; the Archives of the Diocese of Richmond (hereafter ADR), the Baltimore Cathedral archives (hereafter BCA), and, to a lesser extent, in the Archives of the Catholic University of America, and the Archives of St. Mary's Seminary, Roland Park, Baltimore. The writer is indebted to the custodians of these depositories.

Spain and the United States.[4] Between the time of this affair of unhappy memory and his intervention in the Philippine friars' problems, the archbishop made two trips to Europe. The first, in 1899, was a wretched experience for him, which coincided with the issuance of the apostolic letter, *Testem benevolentiae*.[5] The second of these two trips, in the summer of 1900, on the occasion of an invitation to give an address at the unveiling of the Lafayette memorial in Paris,[6] restored his optimism and pointed to a renewal of his usefulness in affairs of Church and State. In the same interval, he nearly broke off relations with President McKinley by taking affront at the latter's refusal to write a letter to the Pope and so help him with Rome;[7]

[4] John T. Farrell, "Archbishop Ireland and Manifest Destiny," *Catholic Historical Review*, XXXIII (October, 1947), 269-301.

[5] Dated January 22, 1899, it was a blow to the prestige of John Ireland who had gone to Europe to avert any censure of so-called Americanism. Thomas T. McAvoy, "Americanism, Fact and Fiction," *Catholic Historical Review*, XXXI (July, 1945), 145. Another explanation of his trip had him going to Rome to justify himself and his conduct in relation to the efforts he made to avert the Spanish-American War. "The influence he is supposed to possess with President McKinley led the Vatican to take certain steps which proved abortive, to the great chagrin of the Pope." Sydney (Australia) *Morning Herald*, February 21, 1899, quoting the Rome correspondent of the London *Daily Telegraph*. I am indebted to the Reverend Patrick H. Ahern of the St. Paul Seminary for this reference to the Sydney paper.

[6] Keeping up his Americanism was, as he told Denis J. O'Connell (ADR, St. Paul, May 28, 1898) "my 'pièce de résistance'" at all times. Farrell, *loc. cit.*, p. 300. Samples, including his Paris speech of July 4, 1900, may be found in John Ireland, *The Church and Modern Society: Lectures and Addresses*, 2 Vols. (New York, 1903).

[7] McKinley had been asked to include Ireland as a commissioner to the Hague Disarmament Conference of 1899. Such a nomination by the President would, in January or February of that year, have been appreciated as a mark of favor to impress Rome with Ireland's position in the United States. It was not forthcoming, and rumors of what had been expected might have circulated; so an earlier plan (cf. Farrell, *loc. cit.*, pp. 275-276) was revived to have McKinley write a letter to the Pope, taking occasion to congratulate Leo XIII on a recovery of good health, and to add something anent the administration's desire to see Archbishop Ireland made a cardinal. The President for good and sufficient reasons, as he thought, refused to go against precedent or risk offending the Pope. (ADR, Thomas O'Gorman to 'Dear Archbishop' [Ireland], Washington, March 13, 189[9]). Bishop O'Gorman of Sioux Falls described in detail his failure to persuade the President, despite support afforded by Senators Mark Hanna, Stephen Elkins, and Cushman K. Davis. Dr. Frederick X. Rooker, secretary to the apostolic delegate in Washington, alleged that Ger-

then, he had a change of heart, in time to contribute handsomely—or so he thought—to the President's re-election in 1900. It was in the course of his 1900 trip abroad that he was brought up to date on the problems of the Philippine Church by Bellamy and Maria Storer. This particular instruction of the Archbishop of St. Paul had been suggested to Mrs. Storer by William Howard Taft in a letter he wrote to her from Manila on July 12.[8]

Bellamy Storer was the United States Minister to Spain, having been sent to Madrid after the war to renew diplomatic relations, and in particular to draw up a new commercial treaty. He had previously (1897-1899) been Minister to Belgium; and he was ambitious to complete the work assigned to him in Spain in order to get the post of Ambassador to France. A handsome person and a wealthy dabbler in politics, he had claims on William McKinley dating back to the time when he had participated in the rescue of that statesman from financial distress; and he underlined these claims by loyal backing which had helped to put the latter, first, in the governor's chair in Ohio, and finally into the White House. Born in Cincinnati in 1847, ten years before the birth of William Howard Taft in the same city, Storer went to Harvard, practiced law at home, and in 1886 married the widow of George Ward Nichols. This marriage is said to have enhanced his standing in local society, for the new Mrs. Storer was a Longworth—one of the first families of the city—and her first mar-

---

many suddenly devised a plan to have all states represented at the Disarmament Conference by existing ambassadors, just as soon as it was bruited about that Archbishop Ireland might be named a commissioner. Rooker also believed that John Hay did not like the Archbishop of St. Paul. (ADR, Rooker to Denis O'Connell, Washington, February 28, 1899; also, same to same, Washington, March 14, 1899, and April 21, 1899). Ireland nursed some resentment. On October 21 he wrote to O'Connell from New York that the President had been asking others how Ireland could be appeased. "I keep away. At the Chicago banquet I sat next to [McKinley]. He was very gracious. I did not allude to old sores: he will regret his action before I am through with him." ADR. Archbishop John J. Keane wrote to O'Connell on November 3, that "Ireland and the President have not yet made up, tho' things are drifting that way. I am helping toward it,—for alienation could do no good." (ADR, Keane to O'Connell, Baltimore, November 3, 1899).

[8] Library of Congress, Taft Papers, File 222, Taft to Maria L. Storer, Manila, July 12, 1900. Unless otherwise noted, all Taft's letters to the Storers (i.e., his copies) and from the Storers to Taft are from this file. They will be cited hereafter only by place and date.

riage had been to the principal entrepreneur of art and cultural improvement in Cincinnati. It was quite natural that Storer should employ his talents to the best of his wife's advantages, so that he not only supported the benign McKinley but went himself to Congress in 1891, serving two terms. Though no speechmaker of importance, he was able to participate in the social life of Washington, and there the Storers formed a close association with the Theodore Roosevelts. Mrs. Storer reveals that the Roosevelts looked upon her home on Rhode Island Avenue as practically their own, that Theodore once gave a dinner party there—a stag affair which she was nevertheless privileged to observe from behind a curtain. Bellamy was at the dinner, a guest in his own house. Indeed, Mrs. Storer became much more the intimate adviser and confidant of Theodore Roosevelt than she was ever close to either of the two Ohio statesmen, McKinley or Taft. It is said that not even Mark Hanna penetrated the inner defenses of McKinley's personality. Taft always recognized the personal acquaintance and the common background of old friends, but he was to Mrs. Storer, "Dear Judge Taft," while Roosevelt was "Dear Theodore" to "Dear Maria;" and the last two had a way of quarreling like intimates up to the point of permanent estrangement in 1906.[9] It would be interesting to speculate on what the Storer

[9] Short sketches of Bellamy Storer and of George Ward Nichols are to be found in the *Dictionary of American Biography*, respectively XVIII, 93, and XIII, 494. Cf. also Maria Longworth Storer, *In Memoriam Bellamy Storer, with Personal Reminiscences of President McKinley, President Roosevelt and John Ireland, Archbishop of St. Paul* (Boston: Privately Printed, Merrymount Press, 1923). Mrs. Storer's life is reflected in the aforegoing. When she died, April 30, 1932, she was eighty-seven years old according to the obituary with a Cincinnati dateline in the New York *Herald Tribune* of May 4. She and her second husband had more than even the normal zeal of converts to the Church. They led exemplary lives, and Bellamy distinguished himself particularly by his charitable work on behalf of prisoners during World War I. He died in 1922 and Mrs. Storer lived out her last years in Paris. For the incident of the dinner party, cf. *In Memoriam Bellamy Storer*, p. 23. It will be remembered that Theodore Roosevelt was first in Washington as Civil Service Commissioner under Grover Cleveland, then, by reluctant appointment of McKinley, Assistant Secretary of the Navy. During the summer of 1900 Taft arrived in the Philippines while Roosevelt was Governor of New York, and about to become the next vice president by nomination of the Republican Party, while Mrs. Storer was escaping into France for a vacation from Madrid. There is a file, 'Mrs. Storer', of her letters to T.R. in the Roosevelt Papers at the Library of Congress.

influence would have become had it not been devoted to an especial concern with Catholic Church affairs, or if Mrs. Storer had not resided so long abroad, but had officiated more persistently as a Washington hostess. Between herself and Theodore Roosevelt there was eventually to be a great contradiction over John Ireland, but in the earlier years of their friendship he was a bond between them. Theodore and Maria shared a great enthusiasm for the St. Paul prelate's promotion to the red hat; each looked upon him as a representative of those forces in the American Church which needed to be encouraged.[10] That Taft also thought highly of Ireland's Americanism and its usefulness in settling Philippine problems is obvious from his correspondence of that summer of 1900.

Mrs. Storer began from Madrid the correspondence with the head of the second Philippine Commission while the latter was on the way to his post. She did not refer to the friars; she seemed rather to be picking up the threads of an earlier discussion about school matters. She warned that Protestant fanatics were getting ready to "pounce upon the Philippines." She disliked the nomination of Frederick W. Atkinson of Springfield, Massachusetts, to be Superintendent of Instruction out there among a Catholic population, noting with displeasure that he was going around visiting Indian and Negro schools in the United States, institutions which were "distinctly *protestant.*" At the same time she was willing to be constructive. "If there is anything which you see in the Church's administration in the Phillipines [*sic*] which is not aiding the cause of our country and our civilization, please tell me frankly just what it is. This sort of reform will be productive of infinitely more improvement than a rushing in of fanatical missions. . . ." [11] Taft replied with reassurances about Atkinson, stating

[10] Cf. *In Memoriam Bellamy Storer,* pp. 42-43. A letter of Governor Theodore Roosevelt to Samuel Hill in Rome, dated April 27, 1899 (ADR), sets forth the former's commendation of Ireland: "I cordially agree with everything you say about Archbishop Ireland. I wanted him sent to the Philippines and then I hoped he could have been sent to the Peace Conference." A covering note of Hill's, probably to Monsignor O'Connell, states that the Roosevelt letter was to be used "in any way so long as it does not get into print. Ireland has not seen or heard of it. He might like it." Note on stationery of Eastern Railway Company of Minnesota, Office of the President, date Aix les Bains, May 13, 1899. ADR.

[11] She connected Atkinson's appointment with press reports of Protestant assemblies, where throngs of zealots were said to be showing great enthusiasm for a rescue of the poor Filipinos from Catholicism! Cf. two letters, with enclosed

that the latter would do what was agreeable to Catholics "within the limitations which I suggested at our last meeting." However, he pointed out that the leaders of the insurrection against Spanish rule had been unfriendly to the Church, and these would like to keep religion out of the schools. Despite this, he hoped "to adopt Archbishop Ireland's plan at Faribault, in Minnesota, and to place not the slightest obstruction to the earnest instruction of the pupils every day in the school house." [12] That the problem confronting him with regard to religious matters was more than a school problem, rather one which embraced the whole clerical population of the Islands, was what he now undertook to point out to her. She had asked for frankness in discussing such things, and he told her candidly what an inconvenience the friars were to him—although here and elsewhere the American official was lacking in frankness as to the essentially political aspects of this inconvenience, as it related to the demands of a narrowly anti-clerical set of Filipino politicians. Before developing further the Taft-Storer-Ireland relationship, a concise account of the way in which the Church had figured in the American occupation of the Philippines is in order.

---

newspaper clippings, Mrs. Storer, Madrid, to Taft, the first with no date but apparently written to Taft on his way to the islands and filed as of 1900, the second, Madrid, May 17, 1900. Library of Congress, Taft Papers. In the first of these letters, she declared that, "Like Theodore Roosevelt, I dread two things: the Catholic reactionary and the Protestant fanatic. The former I feel sure may be overruled, because the church powers exact obedience." Also, in the same letter she begged, "Please keep [the Protestant missionaries] away and let the Catholic Church have the right to help and educate its own people to be as good citizens as the Catholic population of the United States has come to be." In her May 17 letter she again warned against any use of the public schools to be established in the islands to "protestantize" the people, "a purely Catholic population (so far as there is any religion at all)," and suggested a policy of introducing wherever possible American Catholic teachers.

[12] Taft to Mrs. Storer, Manila, July 12, 1900. What Taft believed to be good policy in school matters was evident in his report made in November of that year, that "the Catholic Church is and ought to continue a prominent factor in the life, peace, contentment, and progress of the Philippine people," and that for the school system, "a right to send religious instructors to the public schools to instruct the children of parents who desire it," had been suggested. "This," he said, "is what is understood to be the Faribault plan. It is not certain that this would meet completely the views of the Catholic hierarchy, but it is likely that it would avoid that active hostility to a public-school system which might be a formidable obstacle in spreading education among these

In the first place, the fall of Manila to American arms (August 13-14, 1898) had been a rather peaceful accomplishment, largely owing to the attitude of Bernardino Nozaleda, O.P., Archbishop of Manila, who had been persuaded by Catholic chaplains of the United States besieging forces to influence the civil authorities to surrender with only token resistance.[13] At the time, partly because of American official protests to Aguinaldo's headquarters about the treatment of their clerical prisoners, it may well have seemed likely to the Spanish prelate concerned, as it did to American and Roman ecclesiastical authorities, that the United States forces were performing an act comparable to snatching a brand from the burning.[14] Reassurances as to the attitude the United States was adopting pervaded the following letter written by the Apostolic Delegate in Washington to the Cardinal Secretary of State in Rome:

Most Illustrious . . .

When the esteemed despatch of your eminence . . . reached me, there was in Washington Mgr. Ireland, who on the same evening was supposed to see President McKinley, and I summoned him for an interview . . . and thus took the opportunity to have presented to the President the matter in regard to the religious orders which your eminence suggested to me.

The following day I went to Baltimore to confer on the matter with His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons. From him I learned that he also and already had taken some step in behalf of the Catholic clergy in the Philippine

---

Catholic people. The Commission has reached no definite conclusion upon the matter, but only states the question as one calling for solution in the not far distant future." *Report of the United States Philippine Commission, Nov. 30, 1900* (Washington, 1901), p. 33. The Faribault plan was Ireland's controversial scheme, put into operation in Faribault, Minnesota, to blend Catholic training and the public school system. Cf. Daniel F. Reilly, *The School Controversy, 1891-1893* (Washington, 1943). Further consideration of the school question in Philippine policy will have to be delayed until a later article.

[13] Parker, *op. cit.*, p. 117 and note. Fathers [William] Reaney, [Francis Brooks] Doherty, and [William] McKinnon are credited with the successful negotiation. The elaborate account of LeRoy, *op. cit.*, I, 232 ff., and all other standard accounts, Parker considers too inclined to ignore the part played by these chaplains. For Nozaleda, cf. Robert Streit and Joannes Dindinger, *Bibliotheca missionum* (Aachen, 1937), IX, s. v., "Nozaleda y Villa, Bernardino, O.P."

[14] For the intervention with the insurgents on behalf of the religious prisoners, cf. *Correspondence Relating to the War with Spain . . . from April 15, 1889, to July 30, 1902* (Washington, 1902), II, 804.

Islands. Upon receiving on the 15th inst. a despatch from the Vicar-Apostolic of Hong Kong, wherein he requested [Cardinal Gibbons] to exercise his influence for the release of one hundred priests, prisoners of the insurgents, His Eminence communicated the despatch immediately through the Archbishop of St. Paul to President McKinley. The latter answered to Mgr. Ireland that the government of the United States did not in any way recognize Aguinaldo and his followers; that he had given instructions already to the Commander in Chief at Manila to afford protection to ecclesiastical property and to the lives of the priests, and that if further action in this matter should be necessary, he would give full powers to the commanding general. Your Eminence may have seen confirmation of this in the signed articles for the capitulation of Manila, the sixth of which reads thus: "This city (Manila), its inhabitants, the churches, the exercise of worship, the educational establishments, and all kinds of private property are under the special safeguard of the fealty and honor of the American armed forces." In the aforementioned conference with Mgr. Ireland, the President was very pleased to learn that the people of the Philippine Islands are well disposed toward the clergy, and that the opposition made against the clergy derives principally from the rebels of Malay race. There is now in the making a Commission which as a body will deal with the making of peace. Endeavors are being made that it be composed of persons not prejudiced against but rather well disposed to the Church. According to the declarations made by the President to Mgr. Ireland, and by some ministers of the government, this commission will be called upon to declare and to request that in the territories which will be annexed by the United States, or which will be in one way or another detached from the Spanish rule, and over which the United States will exercise a kind of protectorate or supervision: first, that the Church be officially separated from the state in accord with the American constitution (without this implying hostility to the Catholic Church); second, the absolute protection of the ecclesiastical persons, individuals and corporations; and of the ecclesiastical property either held in the name of an individual or a corporation. Thus, the United States, as regards the persons and the property belonging to the Church, are disposed to recognize the *status quo ante bellum*. The President and the Cabinet are disposed to grant whatever may be reasonably expected by the Catholic Clergy of those regions, for they well know that the clergy is the surest and most effective medium to keep order. Taking into account the dispositions of the government, what the best informed press says, and the opinion of politicians, I think that the religious orders are in no danger of being suppressed or deprived of property. I had evidence of this disposition of the government on the first inst. when I referred to it the despatch of Your Eminence regarding the danger to life which threatened

the priests prisoners of Aguinaldo in Cavite. As soon as the President had been informed by the Postmaster General and by the French Ambassador, he had a telegram sent to Admiral Dewey on the matter, as I already informed Your Eminence. . . .

More danger is to be anticipated here on the part of the Protestant propaganda which is beginning to take form to fall upon the new regions, as I already informed Your Eminence. . . . And these dangers could be even greater than anticipated if it turns out, according to what is divulged by the press to this effect, that the episcopacy and the clergy of those regions intend to withdraw at least in great part, in order to avoid accepting the facts in the new circumstances. Such [a] withdrawal in the beginning would leave the field almost free for the various sects to proselytize and would weaken at least the faith of those people.

This is the information and the report which so far I could gather and which I beg to submit to Your Eminence. I know positively that the President wants to speak also to me directly. However, up to now I could not make up my mind to pay him a visit, for fear that this visit might be misconstrued by those who are against the Church, and therefore might result rather in damage than benefit to it.[15]

This letter, the final paragraph of which illustrates the inadequacy of roundabout communications between the American Government and the Vatican, clarifies at least a benevolent attitude of the United States toward the Church as then constituted in the Philippines. It reveals as well the role of John Ireland as a principal messenger of the occasion, even if he was no longer a principal negotiator for anything. Nothing in the Treaty of Paris, concluded December 10, 1898, worked to the disadvantage of the Catholic Church. The eighth, ninth, and tenth articles of the treaty protected the religious and property rights of persons and corporations, thereby justifying Martinelli's predictions, and also guaranteed were the rights of Spaniards, not excepting clerics, to stay on in the Philippines without even the requirement

[15] Translated from the copy in Italian in BCA. Sebastiano Martinelli to Mariano Cardinal Rampolla, August 23, 1898. (96-M-4). On November 1 Martinelli had occasion to warn Rampolla that Cardinal Gibbons was quite pessimistic about the possibility of working up any sympathy for the religious in the Philippines, at least among the non-Catholics of the United States. Gibbons had spoken of old grudges, more recent calumnies, and the remoteness of the situation when it came to verification of reports. Same to same, Washington, November 1, 1898. Copy in BCA, 96-S-2.

that they become American citizens.[16] For this very favorable legal position the Philippine churchmen are said to have been indebted to the behind the scenes activity of Archbishop Placide L. Chapelle of New Orleans, named Apostolic Delegate to Cuba and Puerto Rico, and envoy extraordinary to the Philippines on October 11.[17] Later on named Apostolic Delegate to the Philippines, he was to be there seven months ahead of William Howard Taft. He was to discover that there would be a great disproportion between what he assumed was owing to the Church under this treaty and what would prove to be politically expedient when the Americans began to take over control. Once the American military forces came to grips with the thwarted Nationalists—the fighting began on February 4, 1899—it became the serious endeavor of the President to substitute negotiation for coercion; the American electorate did not take kindly to fighting an independence movement. Once negotiation produced a basis for civil rule, with the participation in local government of influential Filipinos, a civil rule replaced military government with a suddenness which dismayed those army officers who understood that the Islands were permeated with an active guerrilla organization. No amount of hypocrisy that there was a civil government actually working in the Islands could have misled the outside world, including the United States, if there had been any effort made to enforce the plain meaning of the Treaty of Paris as it affected the Church. The first

[16] W. M. Malloy, *Treaties, Conventions, International Acts . . . between the United States of America and other Powers,* 2 Vols. (Washington, 1910), II, 1693.

[17] Frank Charles Laubach, *The People of the Philippines* (New York, 1925), p. 130. For the date of Chapelle's appointment, see "Placide Louis Chapelle," *D.A.B.* IV, 11. He became Apostolic Delegate to the Philippine Islands nearly ten months later, August 8, 1899. On October 11, 1898, Chapelle wrote to Cardinal Gibbons from Paris, to give notice of his appointment, then again on October 25 to say that the Treaty of Paris promised to be satisfactory in protecting the interests of the Church. (BCA, 96-Q-1, and 96-R-4). Archbishop Ireland's reaction to the original appointment was not one of approval: "What is Chappelle's [*sic*] appointment due to? Abp. Keane should have been the chosen one: but, I suppose, there is no room in Rome for 'Americans.'" (ADR, Ireland to O'Connell, St. Paul, October 27, 1898). Blount asserts (*op. cit.*, pp. 133-134) that Chapelle told him later in Manila that he (Chapelle) got into the treaty the $20,000,000 purchase price for the islands; also, that the Church preferred that "our title should be a title by purchase rather than a title by conquest," although President McKinley "was vigorously urging the latter."

and foremost condition of co-operation on the part of the Filipino politicians was the expulsion of the friars.[18] The insurrection petered out as the principal leaders were captured, met death in battle, or were persuaded to take office under the United States! Even in July, 1902, the month which saw Taft in Rome on the friars' lands business, the month in which, also, President Roosevelt proclaimed the end of the insurrection, the Islands were not exactly a healthy place in which to live—quite apart from the climate's effect upon man.

It would be well beyond the scope of this article to describe in detail the development of Taft's pacification policy in the Islands. He was operating in reverse an earlier policy of co-operation with

[18] The Schurman Commission had reported that it would be necessary to do the following: 1. expel the friars and secure "restitution" of the lands held by them to the townships or to the original owners; 2. recognize Filipino priests in filling incumbencies vacated by the friars; 3. guarantee absolute religious toleration. These were aspirations discovered to have been parts of the insurgent program against Spanish rule, and were found embodied in the "Malabar Proclamation" of July, 1897. *Report of the Philippine Commission to the President, January 31, 1900* (Washington, 1900), I, 83-85. The Schurman Commission had been unable to complete any negotiations, but by the time Taft arrived in the islands (June 4, 1900), the pitched battle stage of the fighting was well over, the insurgents had gone (according to plan) into guerrilla operations, and a sufficient number of "Americanista" politicians were available for bargaining. On the military situation at this point, cf. Blount, *op. cit.*, pp. 307 ff. Blount criticizes severely the Taft view of that time, that the overwhelming majority of Filipinos were willing and anxious to surrender to American "benevolent assimilation," sympathizing rather with General Arthur MacArthur, who believed that the army was confronting a people united in opposition to American rule. *Ibid.*, p. 309. Worcester corrects Blount here by a well documented analysis of the strength of the insurgent movement, proving that it was the work of desperate terrorists, a minority government which was "Government by Murder." Worcester, *op. cit.*, II, 730-767. Worcester does not attempt to prove, however, what Taft—and many other American travellers abroad, *mutatis mutandis*—very likely took for granted, that the people *loved* the Americans. Whether they did or did not was a false issue, put in controversy by the pundits in America from the very beginning of the new Manifest Destiny. But Worcester does differentiate properly between the Filipinos who as a people were inclined to religion and good order, and, on the other hand, the class of careerists who had made the fight against America their business. This differentiation, if Worcester had chosen to be consistent, would have made possible a new estimate of the friar problem, but Worcester, who had been so active on the first United States commission in getting the "evidence" against the friars, who had stayed on under Taft, and eventually became Secretary of the Interior in the islands, never reversed the judgments that the friars were hated by the people and were obstacles to good order.

ST. MARY OF THE SPRINGS
COLLEGE LIBRARY

Church authorities, but his letters to Mrs. Storer give no hint of this; neither do they reveal the embarrassment which this earlier policy had caused American officials.[19] A degree of simplification had been provided by the effects of the insurrection terror upon the remaining friar religious centers and parishes outside Manila. It was no longer a matter of intervening to protect any of the religious; the remainder which survived by escape or rescue kept to the Islands' principal city and seaport. Some had removed to Hongkong. The question now was one of possible restoration in accordance with the plain implications of the treaty. Such a restoration having become politically undesirable, Taft was unpleasantly up against Archbishop Chapelle who, having arrived in the Islands on January 2, 1900, was not too quietly insisting upon it. Numerous Catholics would be voting back in the States in November; and if Bryan defeated McKinley there would be no pacification at all.

Taft wrote to Mrs. Storer from Manila on June 21 to broach the

[19] The reversal of the early military policy, which had included American intervention on behalf of the religious prisoners of Aguinaldo's forces, was begun by the Schurman Commission. General Elwell Otis had been singled out particularly for the wrath of Protestant zealots in the United States for his friendly dealings with the Archbishop of Manila. Parker, *op. cit.*, p. 190. Parker refers to numerous articles in the American press, beginning in 1899, stating the extreme demands of the insurgents against the religious. These included, Andre Bellessort, "A Week in the Philippines," *Living Age*, May 20, 1899; Carlos Gilman Calkins, "Spanish Failures in the Philippines," *New World*, September, 1900, as well as the same author's "The Filipino Insurrection of 1896," in *Harper's New Monthly Magazine*, August, 1899; also, Harold Martin (the Associated Press man in Manila), "The Friars in the Philippines," the *Independent*, August 30, 1900; and Antonio Regidor, "The Filipino Case Against the Friars," the *Independent*, February 7, 1901. In 1898 Murat Halstead published the most violent manifestoes against the religious, which originated among the *junta patriotica* at Hongkong. Murat Halstead, *The Story of the Philippines* (n.p., Our Possessions Publishing Co., 1898), p. 299. Perhaps the foremost liar of importance here was John Forman, English traveller and engineer, a doubtful Catholic, who abused a generous hospitality to collect and publish a great amount of scandal in *The Philippine Islands . . . Historical, Geographical, Ethnographical, Social, and Commercial . . .* (London, 1890; New York, 1893). Some of the above items are still listed occasionally as "impartial," but cf. Ambrose Coleman, O.P., "Do the Filipinos Really Hate the Friars," *American Catholic Quarterly Review* XXX (July, October, 1905), 449-461; 672-685. Parker to the contrary notwithstanding, *op. cit.*, p. 23 and note, Coleman gives every indication of travel in the Philippines, as well as superior knowledge of the friars' conditions.

subject on his mind.[20] Pointing out that he was not passing judgment upon the legitimacy of the complaints, moral or otherwise, made against the religious, which he deemed "irrelevant" anyhow, nevertheless, "the evidence seems to be overwhelming that the people of the Islands are violently opposed to the return of the friars (except the Jesuits) to the parishes in which they formerly officiated." [21] It was clear, he said, that with few exceptions they would be killed unless they always moved with the protection of a file of soldiers. Now if Taft was expecting a peaceful establishment of civil government, even without the complications induced by the presence of the friars, he deserved all the strictures Blount affords[22] as to his ingenuousness. Yet, if he did anticipate trouble, if he could but avoid what non-Catholics would say about his hypothetical endeavors to restore an old 'union of Church and State,' less severe criticisms on the part of anti-imperialists could be answered—or at least endured. Leaving out of consideration the nice question of whether the friars could have assisted effectively in pacification, by a resumption under American protection of their commanding influence in the *barrios*—the insurgents had killed off or maimed too many for any certainty here—one may well imagine what the outcry of staunch Protestants would have been if the friars had been in any way mixed up in those later retaliations inflicted upon Samar by General Jacob Smith, and upon Batangas by General J. F. Bell.[23] In his July 12 letter to the wife of the American Minister to Spain, after reassuring her about Mr. Atkinson, and noting in that connection that the views unfriendly to the Church held by the insurrectionists were not those of the people, Taft returned to the subject of the friars. He reported that his conversations with Catholic chaplains[24] had confirmed him in the belief that the people

[20] Not in the Library of Congress, but a copy marked 'private and confidential' is in BCA, 98-F-5.

[21] *Ibid.* There was a nice discrimination here. The Jesuits were mainly teachers and scientists in the islands. Since they did not constitute a significant parochial clergy, they were no obstacle, as an order, to the ambitions of the native politicians. Mr. Neil Macleod, testifying as an expert on the Philippines before the Schurman Commission, may have been badly coached when he said that *all* the friars were bad—but the Jesuits were the worst of the lot!

[22] *Op. cit.*, p. 300.

[23] *Ibid.*, pp. 378-379, and 386 ff.

[24] Letter cited *supra*, Library of Congress, Taft Papers. Father [E. H.] FitzGerald, stationed in northern Luzon, told him "that it is impossible to hope

would not receive back their former parish priests; and as he heard that she was to entertain Archbishop Ireland "at Trouville" during the summer, he asked that she sound out the latter on the prospects of supplying American priests for service in the islands. Only such as these, he wrote—no doubt for Ireland's as well as Mrs. Storer's edification—could lift the people into a better appreciation of Anglo-Saxon liberty and civilization, "accustoming them to the separation of Church and state," while keeping alive their religious feeling. He was aware, of course, as he told her, of Archbishop Chapelle's presence in Manila, and he assured her that his motive in suggesting that she talk to John Ireland was not to seek other avenues to the Vatican. In fact, as he put it, there was no official relationship of the commission to the problem. He did not mention the Treaty of Paris, but said it had come to this: they could stay or get out; whatever they did was bound to have an important bearing on the subject of pacification, and on his solicitude for the contentment of the Filipinos.

Mrs. Storer replied on August 14 that she had heard from Archbishop Ireland in Rome, to which place he had gone after his July 4 address in Paris.[25] Evidently she had written to him, for she said he had from Rampolla the news that Chapelle's reports gave the story

---

that the Spanish friars will ever be received by the people." But for the possibilities of getting false impressions in northern Luzon, cf. *infra*, note 58. Father [William] McKinnon, who had been acting as superintendent of education in Manila, agreed with Father Fitzgerald however. Only Father Remey [William Reaney?] of the Navy had any idea that the friars should be retained under American protection. This priest believed that in three or four years time the people would be glad to have them. Taft reported this last as "the only evidence we have had on the subject looking to a return of the friars." Both Fathers Fitz-Gerald and McKinnon fell in with his ideas about importing American priests to replace the Spaniards, but Father 'Remey' thought that an impracticable program; he suggested rather that the current unsettled conditions in China would release French priests for the task.

There is on record a letter of McKinnon to the Abbé Alphonse Maignen of Baltimore of December 12, 1898, urging the speedy assistance to the Church of an apostolic delegate, in which he declared that the friars were "good men." Archives of St. Mary's Seminary, Roland Park, Maryland. Parker *(op. cit.,* p. 184) has noted an interview with Archbishop Ireland which was reported in the *Independent* for September 29, 1898, according to which that prelate declared that the friars were there to stay, that they knew their tasks better than any other clergy, and that there was no chance of their being replaced by an American clergy.

[25] Taft Papers, Mrs. Storer to Taft, Villers S/Mer Calvados, August 14, 1900.

of opposition to the friars as deriving mainly from the sentiments of the native Filipino clergy.[26] For his part, said Mrs. Storer, Archbishop Ireland agreed with Taft, but he believed that no matter what the Commission did, a few of the friars would go back to suffer for their obstinacy; after that, the Church would see the wisdom of getting them out of there. Mrs. Storer understood that, thanks to Theodore Roosevelt and Senator Davis, the Vatican had completely changed its view of Ireland, "and he is having a cordial reception now in Rome." She herself hoped to assist the cause of humanity, of religion, and of patriotism, as represented in "so fair minded a man" as Taft. She was sure that Chapelle's appointment to his present post had been a mistake, a result of misinformation to the Vatican by biased ecclesiastics, and she would very much like to have Taft write to her a letter which, in all confidence, she could show to Cardinal Rampolla. Only three days later she wrote again to say she had taken it upon herself to communicate Taft's views to the Cardinal Secretary of State; her opinion meant nothing, but *"yours* is entitled to every consideration."[27]

If Taft had not meant to find new avenues to the Vatican, he had in Mrs. Storer a friend who did intend to find them. She had urged Rampolla to get Chapelle out of his present position, and to replace him with Bishop Thomas O'Gorman of Sioux Falls, one who represented "in every way a liberal and intelligent spirit, without which the Church, humanly speaking, is a mediaeval dead letter." On September 6 she wrote that she believed the Vatican was already coming around to her view that Chapelle was too reactionary. This was premature; but that there had been a change in Rome's attitude toward Archbishop Ireland, that they would listen to him as an echo of the distant voice of the American commission, there could be little doubt. The cordiality shown Ireland made Maria Storer "hope that the Vatican sees clearly now what is the best policy in dealing with American Anglo-Saxons."[28] Bellamy Storer wrote from Paris that he had been sup-

[26] That such antagonism existed was a principal reason for the presence of Filipino priests in the insurgent ranks; and it had important bearing on the subsequent Aglipayan schism. Cf. Parker, *op. cit., passim,* and James A. Robertson, "The Aglipay Schism in the Philippine Islands," *Catholic Historical Review,* IV (October, 1918), 315-344.

[27] Taft Papers, Mrs. Storer to Taft, Villers S/Mer Calvados, August 17, 1900.

[28] Taft Papers, Mrs. Storer to Taft, Villers S/Mer Calvados, September 6, 1900. She hoped the Vatican would appreciate as well "that full measure of American liberty without which we cannot have the best modern civilization

porting Taft's views, and that he and Maria were going to Rome "to push it along." Together they would be "helping McKinley and his Administration more than I should in going home to vote." [29] As the Storers went to Rome, John Ireland turned toward home to explain his vote for McKinley.

Ireland's re-entry as a political figure must have owed something to this Philippine situation as it developed in the summer of 1900. The previous December, when he wrote to Denis O'Connell of the invitation to speak in Paris, he had half a mind, should he accept the invitation, not to go on to Rome at all. Then he decided it would be as bad one way as another, so he would make a "brief and quick" visit there.[30] He left the United States in a mood toward the Vatican which matched his feelings of that time toward McKinley, his intentions no more than, "to speak on the Fourth—Then a rapid journey to Rome, Causa Jubilaei—and then, homeward. What are your plans for the Summer?" [31] On April 29, before departing for Europe, he had two annoyances to report: that a published letter of his to the Duke of Norfolk had, according to the press, given offense to the Vatican "as smacking too much of Americanism;" secondly, that other press reports indicated a likely elevation of Archbishop Michael A. Corrigan of New York to the cardinalate. As to the first, he was glad to give offense, and "Before I return from Europe much more may be given. Resurrexi—and don't doubt the fact." As to the other rumor, he urged O'Connell to let it be well known "that C[orrigan's] opponents live." [32]

---

and which interferes with no man's creed or private affairs." The "Latins" would have to realize that this was the only spirit which could overcome "anarchy and socialism, the danger of the new century." *Ibid.*

[29] Taft Papers, Bellamy Storer to Taft, Paris, October 3, 1900.

[30] ADR, Ireland to O'Connell, St. Paul, December 23, 1899.

[31] ADR, Same to same, St. Paul, April 4, 1900. For Ireland's further estrangement from McKinley at this time, because mutual friends had been unable to get from the President a really 'official' character for the archbishop to show when he delivered the speech in Paris, cf. ADR, Rooker to 'My dear Monsignore' [O'Connell], Washington, October 22, 1900.

[32] ADR, Same to same, St. Paul, April 29, 1900. This, and the two letters cited just before, mark a resumption of a regular correspondence which had suffered a brief interruption after the 1899 Ireland trip to Europe. On his way back to the United States in July of that year, Ireland told O'Connell in a letter written from shipboard just what the latter's shortcomings were—with

The foregoing is in great contrast to his buoyant friendliness to both civil and ecclesiastical authorities on his return home. Instead of having made a "brief and quick" visit to Rome, he was not back until October. Rumors of a red hat at the next consistory preceded him to Washington.[33] On the way, in London, he was quoted as the bearer of good tidings to the Republican Party in the United States:

> London, Oct. 1—Archbishop Ireland, who has arrived here from Rome on his way to the United States, said in an interview today that in one of the audiences which the Pope granted him Leo said:
>
> "We are well pleased with the relations of the American Government to the Church in Cuba and the Philippines. The American Government gives proof of good will and exhibits a spirit of justice and respect for the liberty and rights of the Church. You will thank in my name the President of the Republic for what is being done."
>
> Archbishop Ireland continued: "When I repeated to Cardinal Rampolla, the Papal Secretary of State, my conversation with the Pope the Cardinal declared such statements were what he personally believed and knew to be true, and that I was at liberty to repeat them to the American people. Further, Cardinal Rampolla said that on no less than three different occasions petitions had been sent to the Vatican in the name of the Filipino leaders asking that direct official relations be opened between them and the

---

particular reference to rash statements and gossip which had made him a liability to the other 'Americans.' ADR, Ireland to O'Connell, July 24, 1899. On October 21, and without apologizing, Ireland wrote that he had been aware "you would turn up your nose," but that he believed "the hour has come when you are ready to resume friendly and diplomatic relations." ADR, Same to Same, St. Paul, October 21, 1899.

[33] ADR, Rooker to 'My dear Monsignore' [O'Connell], Washington, October 22, 1900. Rooker was amazed that the latter should pass on such a suggestion; in no single event could he see any justification for optimism about Ireland's promotion. Although he complained about having been kept in the dark about developments, he was inclined to think this rumor had come from Ireland's too sanguine assurances while in Rome "that this administration is very favorable to the Church, and has been doing and is willing to do kind things to it in the settlement of matters in the new possessions. In the first place, this is not so." *Ibid.* What Rooker did believe was that Rome had been careful to assuage the feelings of Ireland, making up for the hard knocks given him the year before. The appointment of that other prominent American, Archbishop John J. Keane, to the See of Dubuque was of a piece with the kindness shown Ireland. Nevertheless, Rome had actually reaffirmed the dangers of Americanist principles and Ireland might have been too easily impressed. *Ibid.*

Vatican, but the Vatican had always refused to listen to such petitions out of consideration for the American Government." [34]

In New York on October 19 he was quoted more elaborately to the same effect, saying, among other things, that he was both astonished and pleased to find Rome so well informed on matters religious and political in the Philippines and in Cuba; "and as they have the interests of the church in those countries most deeply at heart, and know far better than we in America could know what the rights of the church are and how best such rights may be defended, Americans, Catholics and others, may safely accept their judgment of things, and not give themselves further and needless trouble about the religious conditions of the Philippines or Cuba." It was a matter of fact, he said, that "the only safety which the Catholic church at the present time has in the Philippines for the possession of her properties and for the lives of her priests is the protection afforded by the American flag, and all this is fully understood and fully recognized in Rome." [35] It was also clear to him, according to still another interview, that, as never before, American prestige was at a high level in the opinion of all Europe. A reversal, "through our next Presidential election, of policies that have lifted us up in such prominence will be interpreted by foreign nations as indications of unsettled conditions in our own country, and of changeableness of political and commercial opinions and methods, and would result in lowering us immensely in the estimation in which we are now held by foreign countries." [36]

This was all too much for Bishop Bernard J. McQuaid of Rochester, the ramrod personality who so often spoke for the anti-Ireland party in the American hierarchy. It was to him that Archbishop Ireland attributed the counterblast which originated in the Rochester *Union*

[34] ADR, Clipping from unidentified newspaper, given here because it was first in date of similar statements recurring in the American press. Another clipping, dated Geneva, October 14, quoted Bellamy Storer on his interview with Leo XIII: "Since Archbishop Ireland's visit to the Vatican it is clearly understood there that the best interests of the Roman Catholic Church demand American rule in the Philippines. The United States and the Catholic Church have the same aims there and hope to work together for order and peace." *Ibid.*

[35] ADR, Clipping from Chicago *Chronicle*: 'Special Telegram,' New York, October 19.

[36] ADR, Another unidentified clipping, no date, under headline, 'Ireland Tells Europe's View,' and 'Archbishop Says American Prestige Would Suffer Should Bryan Win.'

and Advertiser for October 4, 1900[37] ("practically recognized as his organ," said Ireland).[38] After reviewing unfavorably the history of the St. Paul prelate as "a writer and speaker in Republican national campaigns," his acceptance of the "office" of commander of the French Legion of Honor, "in violation of the letter and spirit of the United States constitution," the Rochester paper pointed out that Ireland's sponsorship of the American cause in the Philippines was opposed to the growing tendency of the Church in this country to be very critical of American policy there. It cited a despatch from Washington of October 2 to the New York *World,* which that paper had carried in its columns the day after:

> Surprise is expressed in Catholic Church circles today over the interview with Archbishop Ireland cabled from London to The World, in which he said that the Pope felt grateful to the McKinley [administration] because of favors received in the Philippines [and in] Porto Rico [*sic*]. Information directly to the contrary has recently come to church representatives here. The hostile tone of some of Gen. Otis's proclamations in Manila, and the marriage laws promulgated in Cuba and Porto Rico have greatly disturbed the Vatican, and several notes on the subject have been exchanged with Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop Corrigan and other influential members of the American hierarchy. The looting of the churches in the Philippines has never been satisfactorily explained, and many of the archbishops and bishops have complained to Rome on this score.
>
> It is said that in his interview Archbishop Ireland does not voice the sentiment of his colleagues, who are opposed to the present Government in its policy in our new possessions and on several other vital questions. Cardinal Gibbons last week called the attention of the Navy Department to the fact that two chaplains, Fathers Reaney and Reynolds, were not receiving fair treatment. Father Reaney was chaplain of the Olympia and since the return of Admiral Dewey has been, according to the Cardinal's opinion, unjustly discriminated against and given unpleasant and unimportant duties. Father Reynolds, the Cardinal says, has suffered similarly. Both of these men were appointed on the personal request of the Cardinal, and with one other, Father John Chidwick, former chaplain of the Maine, are the only Catholic chaplains in the navy.

The *Union and Advertiser* went on for about one and a third columns to remind the "St. Paul Republican divinity" that the record of the first and second United States commissions to the Philippines

[37] Clipping in ADR.

[38] ADR, Ireland to O'Connell, St. Paul, October 27, 1900. He enclosed the clipping from the *Union and Advertiser.*

had been one of veiled hostility to the Church, and concluded with an expression of regret that the Church was made "a football in the political arena by one of its own Archbishops, and bitter and blatant Republican partisan of M'Kinleyism and Imperialism, and is kicked by that divinity from London, by cable, into the faces of the American people." Bishop McQuaid was himself leaving for Rome that month, and on departure he was quoted by the New York *Herald*[39] as hoping "that party will succeed which will best bring us back to our former state of affairs. This country will be amply engaged if it attends strictly to its own interests." Ireland heard that the Bishop of Rochester was going to prefer charges against him at the Vatican.[40]

It was on a brief stopover in Washington that Ireland renewed cordial relations with McKinley. The President was "much pleased with what I have said—'Most honored' that the Pope expressed satisfaction with the attitute of his administration toward the Church."[41] To Bellamy Storer he wrote that he had been well able "to learn from the campaign managers" that "the Catholic vote has been the cause of serious anxiety to the party; the Democrats were making active capital out of persecutions, and neglect of Catholics, and it was feared the whole Catholic vote would be lost. Your interview and mine came as a God-send, and were fully appreciated. They have had a wonderful effect: the stock-in-trade arguments of Democracy have been swept away."[42]

[39] ADR, Clipping marked October 10, 1900.

[40] ADR, Ireland to O'Connell, St. Paul, October 27, 1900. "The preferment of charges by Bp. McQuaid is all the more extraordinary that on the eve of his departure he gave out himself a Bryanite interview. Handle the good man as well as you can." *Ibid.*

[41] *Ibid.* His rapid movement is indicated in what Rooker told O'Connell:

> Then, the morning after your cable got here, he landed in New York. I expected that he would show up here and give some information and show just how things stand there and help by suggestions to carry out the request you made. Instead of doing this, he staid in New York several days talking McKinley to the papers. And finally came down here yesterday morning without telling anyone he was coming. Arrived here, he goes to see McKinley, and then comes to the Delegation. Everybody was out but the Delegate. He saw him and announced that he was to leave town in a couple of hours. I did not know he was coming and did not know that he was here until after he had gone.

ADR, letter of October 22, 1900, cited *supra.*

[42] *In Memoriam Bellamy Storer,* pp. 48-49. St. Paul, October 27, 1900, is the date given there of the letter. This was the day he wrote to O'Connell about

But there was no apparent marginal vote which decided the election of 1900. McKinley was returned by an overwhelming victory in the electoral college: 292 for him as against 155 for William Jennings Bryan. Outside the 'solid' South, only four 'silver' States went Democratic. On October 9 Mrs. Storer had understood that the election was a sure thing for McKinley[43]; but from Rome she wrote to Taft that the Philippine situation required not only the re-election of the President in November—it also required an elevation thereafter of John Ireland to the cardinalate:

> The situation is brifly this: If we can get Archbishop Ireland made Cardinal he will be in a position to help our Government in every way, for he will be raised above all the petty quarrels and the malice of his reactionary enemies. He will be a great power in the next Conclave, and he will be a factor in the choice of a non-reactionary Pope.

To ensure this, and to overcome in particular the German opposition to Ireland, it was essential that McKinley do presently what he had been too timid to do a year earlier—he must send a letter by her husband, Bellamy, urging that the good archbishop be made a cardinal. Then they could anticipate a blessing for the whole world: "With an American Cardinal like Archbishop Ireland, we might even hope to have an American Pope one day."

Out in Manila, the Philippine Commission was highly elated by the election returns, estimating properly their effect upon insurgent morale.[44] Commissioner Taft counted another victory: Apostolic Delegate Chapelle was "dead politically," hopelessly involved with the discredited friars.[45] That the two events, the re-election of McKinley

---

Bishop McQuaid enclosing the clippings. He reported that McKinley seemed very favorable to doing all in his power to remove the Storers from Madrid to Paris. *Ibid.*, pp. 49-50.

[43] Taft Papers, Mrs. Storer to Taft, Hotel d'Angleterre, Rome, October 9, 1900. But on November 20 she was certain that John Ireland's and Bellamy's interviews had meant "at the last moment thousands of Catholic votes." Same to same, Madrid, November 20, 1900. In her book, published long enough afterwards for details to have become somewhat blurred in her memory, Mrs. Storer recalled that her husband and Bishop O'Gorman carried "a message" from McKinley to Rome when they went there in September, 1900. *In Memoriam Bellamy Storer*, pp. 45-46.

[44] Pringle, *op. cit.*, I, 190.

[45] Taft Papers, Taft to Mrs. Storer, Manila, December 4, 1900.

and the political eclipse of Chapelle, were both the results of the summer's correspondence between Taft and the Storers amounted to much more than any of the friends, Taft, Ireland, or Bellamy and Maria Storer would claim. But each event was necessary for progress in the Commission's treatment of the friar problem, and in a manner not then obvious to any but the parties immediately concerned out in the Philippines, the Storers and John Ireland had made the election the instrument to kill off Chapelle politically. One result of the summer's correspondence given above was a Vatican endorsement of American rule in the new possessions. However little that endorsement counted in the election, it at least headed off any movement to brand the Republican as 'anti-Catholic,' as the McQuaid party might have seen fit to do, while, out in the Philippines, it must have destroyed utterly any hopes Chapelle might have had of combatting the Commission. The friars would get no American support to justify their return to the parishes and to a position of respect among the Filipino people; but their enemies would get the stamp of American approval, and so fill the local offices which would enable them to exercise a large measure of control over the villagers' words and actions, if not their thoughts.

As things were at the time not favorable to the Church in the Philippines, the reasons for such usable quotations as those which Archbishop Ireland gave to the press are not obvious. We must assume that the apostolic delegate in Manila did not tell the Vatican what it should have known. Some support for this assumption is furnished by the letter to O'Connell of October 22, written from the delegation in Washington by Monsignor Rooker. If, as Rooker suspected, Ireland had been giving the Vatican false ideas about the benevolence of the American Government, then he was confirming "all the trash with which Mgr. Chapelle has filled it for his own benefit and advancement." For two years, according to Rooker, Chapelle had been telling the Pope "fairy tales" about the "extremely considerate treatment" he had received, and "what wonderful things the government was going to do for the Church." Rooker said he had this information from Chapelle's successor in Cuba and Puerto Rico, Bishop Donatus Sbarretti, who was, he told Rooker, very much embarrassed because he was expected to realize now on all the supposed promises made to Chapelle.[46] If Rooker had the truth about this,

[46] ADR, cited *supra*.

and if the "fairy tales" account for the Vatican's willingness to have Archbishop Ireland and the Storers cast its vote, as it were, for McKinley, some appalling irony is to be noted in the result for Chapelle. That the latter acquired some knowledge of Taft's other avenues to the Vatican—too late to do anything about them—is evident from the letter he wrote to Mrs. Storer on November 21. He told her that in assuming an unfriendly attitude toward him she had acted *"unwisely* and *ungratefully,"* and that the two epithets needed no comment. He extended his compliments to Mr. Storer, and asked that she tell her husband he was exceedingly rejoiced to hear that McKinley was re-elected by such a magnificent majority. Mrs. Storer replied to His Grace that she only supported the policy of her government by promoting friendly relations between the Vatican and the United States, and that she considered it was to the best interests of the Church and the American people that Archbishop Ireland be made a cardinal. She sent Chapelle's letter and her own reply to Taft, who wrote, naturally, that he was much amused.[47] It was probably the occasion for one of his famous chuckles.

On December 4, 1900, Taft sent Mrs. Storer the Commission's report on the friars, an exposure of their iniquities which, he said, he was also forwarding to the Secretary of War. If that dignitary, Elihu Root, thought it wise to publish it, then it would appear in print. What was revealed, he declared, was "mild compared with what might have been said."[48] It is not necessary to believe that this report was timed deliberately to appear after the election. It elaborated charges of corruption and immorality already pretty well set forth in the Schurman Commission's *Report*;[49] it confirmed what had earlier

[47] Taft Papers, Mrs. Storer to Taft, enclosures, Biarritz, January 15, 1901. Taft to Mrs. Storer, Manila, February 22, 1901.

[48] Taft Papers, Taft to Mrs. Storer, Manila, December 4, 1900. Of course, Taft assured Mrs. Storer here that he differentiated between the friars and the Church; for the latter, as an institution, he had a great respect.

[49] *Report of the Philippine Commission to the President, Jan. 31, 1900* (Washington, 1900), I, 62, 82; II, 4, 42, 43, 93, 99, 132, 143, 363, 370, 371, 395, 396, 399, 403, 404, 408, 419, 421. The report which Taft sent to Mrs. Storer was printed as Senate Document No. 190, 56th Congress, 2nd Session: *Message from the President of the United States, Transmitting, in Response to Resolution of the Senate of January 26, 1901 a Report from the Secretary of War . . .* (Washington, 1901). Mrs. Storer advised Taft that his report on the friars ought to be published to help shape the policy of the Vatican, "and to bring it your way." Taft Papers, Mrs. Storer to Taft, Biarritz, January 15, 1901.

been said about the central political role played by the friars in the Spanish period; it amounted to support by understatement of what Protestant propaganda had been saying since 1898; and it now permitted officials of the religious orders and the Archbishop of Manila to have their direct testimony presented in juxtaposition to the testimony of their enemies.[50] As to the last point, there was, of course, no cross examination of anyone's evidence. But it was after the election that Taft revealed, to another than Mrs. Storer or any member of the administration, that he was hopelessly at odds with Archbishop Chapelle. On November 30 he wrote to Joseph Bucklin Bishop that the apostolic delegate:

> though he professes Americanism, is completely under the influence of the friars who have surrounded him and he is very anxious to fight their battles. He has reported to Rome that the friars are not unpopular except with the native clergy and a few leading men in each town belonging to the Katipunan Society, but in this he is utterly mistaken and has reached the conclusion only by crediting friar sources.[51]

Chapelle did, indeed, accept the friars' estimate of the origins of opposition to themselves, but he was by no means "utterly mistaken" in the analysis which Taft attributed to him. The Commission's policy of a speedy introduction of civil government in place of military rule[52] promised to be successful, only if the Filipino leaders could be persuaded to co-operate by inducing a gradual alleviation of the guerrilla warfare, which then had 70,000 American soldiers, operating from more than 500 stations, holding "a still vigorous enemy in check."[53] This co-operation would be denied to the Americans just

[50] This was to no advantage for the Church. The straightforward and unequivocal statements of the officials queried, including admissions that occasional human weaknesses occurred among the friars, could be construed by the unfriendly critic as only introductory to the scandal elaborated by others in their testimony. *Message from the President, op. cit.*, pp. 47, ff.

[51] Taft Papers, Philippine Series, Out I, 1900-1901, Taft to Bishop, Manila, November 30, 1900.

[52] The Taft Commission acquired legislative powers on September 1, 1900. Pringle, *op. cit.*, I, 192. It was then able to assert its powers over the military and to get in hand the $2,500,000 available from the customs and other sources.

[53] Such was the admission, but in 1904, by Elihu Root in his address to the Republican National Convention. It is cited by Blount, *op. cit.*, p. 279, who points out that this state of affairs as to armed guerrilla resistance was carefully concealed from the American people in 1900.

as long as there remained any suspicion that the friars would be restored to their parishes.[54] On the other hand, no responsible authority denies that the Filipino Masonic organization, known as the Katipunan Society, was principally concerned in bringing about the elimination of the friars, that it wielded heavy sanctions on all politicians, or that it furnished the hard core of a then organized opposition to American rule. When warfare had broken out between the forces of Aguinaldo and the American troops on February 4, 1899, this society had a complete network "pervading every town and hamlet, striking terror into every native household." They made all 'elected' officials their secretly appointed puppets, compelling them to deceive the Americans, while acting to collect money and supplies for the Insurgent army, afterwards for the organized guerrilla forces.[55]

It was the Katipunan which had used terroristic methods in combatting the influence of the religious during the last decade of Spanish rule—though not to the point of complete success, until the Americans overthrew the Spanish regime by injecting Aguinaldo into the Islands in 1898. Established in July, 1892, a year and a half after the Spanish Freemasons had complied with previously long denied demands that charters be granted to native and *mestizo* lodges, the Katipunan became the Filipino *carbonari* of the 1890's.[56] The tortures

[54] This had been made clear to the Schurman Commission in the previous year. Cf. the testimony *(Report . . . Jan. 31, 1900,* cited *supra,* II, 144-146) of Señor Felipe Calderon, lawyer, conservative Americanista, afterwards a distinguished member of the Philippine Commission. He obviously longed for peace, but he would have no objection if the Americans "shot the friars," who were "hated by the people," and although the friars were anti-American, the war went on between Americans and Filipinos because the people believed that the Americans were in favor of the friars.

[55] Parker, *op. cit.,* p. 254, citing Col. L. W. V. Kennon in *North American Review,* CLXXIII (August, 1901), 208-220. Parker here credits Kennon with more knowledge of the Katipunan than "any other American."

[56] Parker, *op. cit.,* pp. 12, ff. The first Filipino lodge was founded in January, 1891, and within sixteen months there were eighty-five of them in the islands, all centers of disaffection, but to be distinguished from the Katipunan Society, which was only an enormous tail to the kite of Freemasonry. The full name was Kataastaasan Kagalang-galang Katipunan ng mga Anak ng Bayan, which is to be translated as, Highest and Most Venerable Association of the Sons of the People. Cf. G. F. Zaide, *Philippine History and Civilization* (Manila, 1939), p. 466. The reader of Zaide's work, who also understands the ways and means of textbooks, need not be surprised to find that a legend of the Katipunan has been developed—they *(loc. cit.)* now appear to have been something like the Boy Scouts.

of the religious prisoners in 1898 had amounted to a vengeance worked upon them by the Katipunan for what the friars had done to spoil the revolutionary uprising of 1896.[57] Dean C. Worcester is quite explicit in detailing these atrocities and the enormities perpetrated by the society as it worked to prevent a pacification of the Islands under the United States. As to their mode of influence, he has this to say:

> It has been claimed that there was no opposition to the Katipunan Society, and that the Filipinos everywhere joined it gladly. This was not the case. At different times there were a number of similar organizations opposed to it, and most important of these was the "Guards of Honour." Its members were ruthlessly murdered. On April 18, 1900, a guerilla chief in Union Province found it necessary to order that all towns in which members of the "Guards of Honor" lived should be burned with property of the members of that association; that their fathers, mothers, wives and sons should be beheaded, while the men themselves should receive that punishment or be shot. All grown men in every town . . . were to proceed immediately to aid in the attack upon the Americans and Guards of Honour under pain of being shot or beheaded.[58]

[57] That it was an Augustinian, Padre Mariano Gil, who ferreted out the conspiracy rather than one of the Spanish civil officials, is a plain indication of the relative alertness of the friars in such matters. This alone would account for the wrath directed against the latter by the separatists. Only clerics stayed long enough in the islands to know what the mysteries of oriental Filipino life could be, a fact which is pointed up when one notes that between 1853 and 1898, in the period of greatest religious and political unrest, there were forty-one Spanish governors but only five archbishops in Manila. Parker, *op. cit.*, p. 5. In the case of the 1896 conspiracy, Padre Mariano received his information from a girl in the family of a disaffected member of the Katipunan—her brother, who had just been beaten up in a fight over lodge funds. She had first told her story to the mother superior of the convent of the College of Mandalova where she was a student. Cf. Francis St. Clair, *The Katipunan, or the Rise and Fall of the Filipino Commune* (Manila, 1902), pp. 293-301. St. Clair claims to reproduce the story exactly as he found it in a personal letter of Mariano to that priest's family in Spain.

The practical outcome of the American attempts to rescue the religious in 1898 was that the Filipino leaders spread far and wide that the Americans, like the Spaniards, were under the control of the friars. James A. LeRoy, *The Americans in the Philippines*, I, 323. LeRoy gives reluctant credence to the reality of barbaric mistreatment of the religious who were prisoners, as set forth in Father Graciano Martinez' *Memorias del Cautivero* (Manila, 1900).

[58] Worcester, *op. cit.*, II, 741. Cf. *Ibid.*, I, 172-205, and *passim*, for his accounts of atrocities as practised on the religious. Worcester's omission there-

Taft and the other members of the American Commission may have been obstinately ignorant of all this; and the commission included Dean C. Worcester, who had taken over intelligence activities from the army for a short period during his time of work under Schurman.[59]

---

after, however, of anything that would reflect upon the American handling of the problem of the friars, has been nothing short of fascinating to this historian. The issue amounted to this: did the friars have a claim, better than anything the insurgent leaders had, to be in the towns and villages? The latter claimed to be there by consent of the people. Worcester demolished all the evidence which Blount offered to support the insurgent claims. Very interesting is Worcester's confession that an apparent unanimity of opinion among Filipino residents of any place, outside of Manila, was all too likely to be a deceptive front worked up for the benefit of strangers. Using captured insurgent records and correspondence, he demonstrates this point with reference to the trip made together by Paymaster W. E. Wilcox and Naval Cadet L. R. Sargent, of the United States Navy, October-November, 1898 in northern Luzon. Blount had made much of the pair's reports of orderly life under insurgent rule *(op. cit.,* pp. 107-120). Worcester shows how the two Navy men were detained from time to time, in one place or another, so that the scenery could be carefully prepared for them. *Op. cit.,* I, 152, ff. This was the area upon which Father FitzGerald had reported for Taft as to a supposedly popular antagonism to the friars.

Of course, among anti-imperialists in the United States, opponents of Spanish, then of American rule in the islands, have never appeared in any guise but as patriots. For instance, cf. Moorfield Storey and M. P. Lichauco, *The Conquest of the Philippine Islands, 1898-1925* (New York, 1925).

[59] American intelligence activities may not have been very good. The United States Army had been imposed upon to the extent that the Katipunan's principal organizer in Manila in 1898 was Teodoro Sandiko, who, while an employee of the army provost marshall's office, was then, and for some time afterwards, a member of Aguinaldo's cabinet. LeRoy, *op. cit.,* I, 352-353, note. LeRoy here calls the branches of the society "popular clubs." They were popular chiefly in the sense that wealth and social position were not prerequisites for membership; but neither were wealth nor social position proof against their pressures. LeRoy also criticizes Archbishop Chapelle severely for a letter of the archbishop which accompanied some Dominicans on their way to the Batanes Islands: "The accusations adduced against [the friars] are the merest pretexts of shrewd and anti-American Filipino politicians. . . . As you know, it is sufficient for three or four men to mislead a whole town in these islands." Says LeRoy: "At the time of writing . . . the papal delegate had been but three months in the Philippines, had not been outside of Manila and its suburbs, had seen comparatively few people outside of the friar archbishop, the friars, and the circle surrounding them, and knew of Philippine history and current politics only what they told him." *Op. cit.,* II, 301 note. Cf. *Report of the War*

Meanwhile the apostolic delegate lingered on in Manila, long after he had been rendered politically ineffective. On April 13, 1901, about to depart for Rome, he wrote to Taft that he regretted his inability to call in person, but he would give in writing a criticism of the American Commission's work:

> That the Civil Commission of the United States to these Islands has taken, unconsciously perhaps, indirectly surely, a hostile attitude towards the Catholic Church and her interests as officially represented by your humble servant is to my certain knowledge the sincere conviction of all the conservative, wise and serious minded men, both here and in America, with whom I have had the honor to have had any relations concerning this grave fact.[60]

Both the President and Mr. Root sincerely hoped that he had left Manila for good, and they told John Ireland so;[61] and he so informed Mrs. Storer, who had long ago made that her business.

As for Archbishop Ireland, he devoted the weeks after his return to the United States, and after his brief but telling foray in the newspapers, to matters of his own archdiocese which kept him very busy. "I do my work, and 'vogue la galère,' " he told Monsignor O'Connell. But giving only an occasional thought to Rome, he remarked that he had but "a few vague, indefinite Cablegrams from Bishop O'Gorman" still in the Eternal City, and "I wish you would send me Something terse and clear."[62] O'Connell did send him in November, a *"Certe Scio,"* terse, definite, and presumably referring to the predicted work of the next consistory. Ireland responded with joy to what he understood to portend a remarkable "revolution of ideas and tendencies."[63]

Department 1900, I, Part 4, pp. 235-237. Obviously, Chapelle had learned more in three months than most Americans did.

[60] Taft Papers, Chapelle to Taft, Manila, April 13, 1901.

[61] Ireland to Mrs. Storer, May 2, 1901. *In Memoriam Bellamy Storer,* pp. 55-56. In a letter to Taft, April 23, 1901, Mrs. Storer said that the "Vatican should give you Bishop O'Gorman as a Catholic Prelate in the Philippines to negotiate with you—and that Archbishop Ireland should be sent to Rome by our government as an *American citizen* and their agent to convey our ideas directly to the Vatican. It is feasible?" Taft Papers, Mrs. Storer to Taft, Biarritz, April 23, 1901.

[62] ADR, Ireland to O'Connell, St. Paul, October 27, 1900.

[63] ADR, Same to same, acknowledging cablegrams, St. Paul, November 16, 1900.

"Recall," he said, "the gloom of the evening of my leaving Rome in April 1898—and your own reiteration of the hopelessness of the situation on my return to Rome last July. How much is there to be said?"[64]

However, on December 20 he was writing to Mrs. Storer from New York[65] that he hoped she was too pessimistic, that he could not believe that, whatever the Spanish bishops were saying in Rome, it would alter the minds of the Pope or Cardinal Rampolla. Whatever "suspicions" might be put in the minds of people in the Vatican, they still would say nothing for the public, "and we have no reason whatever to imagine that our friends in America will have any cause to think that we did not give most trustworthy information, when we did speak of them, of Rome's opinions." Just as in the months after his brief diplomatic career in 1898, he was again worrying that the two capitals, Rome and Washington, were not in accord—and had he again given the impression of misleading the Vatican? All appearances indicated that he was "stronger with McKinley than ever before." He had high hopes of getting the President to move the Storers to Paris.

Archbishop Ireland got no red hat, then or later. But in 1901 he received an honorary LL.D. from Yale University, Taft's *alma mater*. By May of that year he had begun discussions with Secretary of War Root, looking to the purchase of the friars' Philippine properties.[66]

The Catholic University of America

[64] *Ibid.* Archbishop Ireland obviously meant to write '1899' rather than '1898' for in the month of April, 1898, he was in Washington trying to avert war.

[65] *In Memoriam Bellamy Storer,* pp. 51-53.

[66] *Ibid.*, p. 56. For his word to O'Connell about the honorary degree, cf. ADR, Ireland to O'Connell, November 6, 1901. ". . . I am L.L.D. altho' my knowledge of law has not grown one whit. The advantage is that I have been thrown among many, whose acquaintance I value." It could be that Taft had suggested the honor to the Yale Corporation. He had been very sympathetic about Ireland's failure to be promoted to the cardinalate, but he had not cooperated just as Mrs. Storer had desired him to do. He did not write to McKinley about it, he told Mrs. Storer, because the President knew what the situation was, and had intimated already that he preferred not to make any request of the Pope. (Taft Papers, Taft to Mrs. Storer, Manila, December 4, 1900). She sent Taft a long letter on April 2, 1901, complaining that Ireland had been passed over because it was believed he really had no influence with the Republican Party, and not many friends in his own Church—all of which, she

believed, was propaganda of the Corrigan group. (Taft Papers, Mrs. Storer to Taft, Biarritz, April 2, 1901). In the same letter she asked Taft to write her something she could use to counteract this—asking him at the same time what he thought of establishing diplomatic relations between the United States and the Vatican. Taft ignored the latter point, but he obliged with an encomium as to Ireland's usefulness, character, and standing with the administration; and he stated that to his knowledge no other prelate in the United States had such an influence in the Church or even outside the Church. He declared that he was sure a red hat for John Ireland would ameliorate the "unjust but still existent" prejudice against the Church in the United States. (Taft Papers, Taft to Mrs. Storer, Manila, May 19, 1901).

MISCELLANY

The Thirtieth Annual Meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association, Boston, December 28-30, 1949.

The thirtieth annual meeting of the Association was held at the Hotel Statler in Boston on December 28-30, 1949, and proved to be one of the best meetings in years. It had been fourteen years since the Association had been in Boston and the large attendance at all the sessions indicated that the long interval had in no way dimmed the interest of our New England members and their friends in the Association's work. There were 151 registrations which was nearly thirty above the total for Washington the previous year and the 123 luncheon guests on the second day and the ninety-three on the final day were well above recent attendances at luncheon conferences.

On the first day the Executive Council held its meeting at lunch and the business meeting convened in the afternoon. The business of the Association as transacted at that meeting can be followed in the reports which are published in this issue of the Review. On the second morning the joint session of the Association with the American Historical Association on the subject, "French-Canadian Immigration into New England in the Nineteenth Century," drew a crowd of well over 250 to hear the stimulating papers of Mrs. Iris Saunders Podea of West Long Branch, New Jersey, which our members who were not present can read in one of the future issues of the *New England Quarterly*. The second paper by Mason Wade of Windsor, Vermont, will appear in a future issue of our own Review. Father Robert H. Lord, pastor of St. Paul's Church, Wellesley, acted as chairman of the session and the discussion was ably led by Professor J. Bartlett Brebner of Columbia University and H. Edward Finnegan, S.J., of Boston College who substituted for William L. Lucey, S.J., of the College of the Holy Cross who was prevented by illness from being present. Following the joint session a luncheon conference was held with President Henry S. Lucas in the chair. The guests heard Miss Helen C. White of the University of Wisconsin in a delightful and informal talk on "Writing Historical Romance," but the second speaker, the Most Reverend John J. Wright, Bishop of Worcester, was, unfortunately, prevented from reading his paper due to the fact that the room assigned for the luncheon conference had been held by a previous group until so late that, by the time Miss White concluded, the Latin American historians were waiting at the door for their afternoon session. However, Bishop Wright's talk can be read in this issue of the Review.

On the last day the morning session was given over to the theme, "Aspects of Church Policy in the Thirteenth Century," with Jeremiah F. O'Sullivan of Fordham University in the chair and the two papers—heard by over 100 listeners—on the 1274 Council of Lyons, and on the papal

inquisition, were read respectively by Richard W. Emery of Queens College and Albert C. Shannon, O.S.A., of Merrimack College. The discussion leaders at this session were William A. Hinnebusch, O.P., of Providence College and James A. Corbett of the University of Notre Dame. The annual meeting was concluded on Friday, December 30, with a luncheon conference at which Allan J. Doherty, chairman of the Committee on Program, substituted as chairman for Waldemar Gurian of the University of Notre Dame who was prevented from being present. The Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, gave a stirring address on "The Need for the Study of American Church History," which may be read in this issue of the REVIEW, and the guests then heard Professor Henry S. Lucas' presidential address which was published in the January number of our journal.

The thirty-first annual meeting of the Association will be held at the Hotel Stevens in Chicago during next Christmas week.

The reports of the officers and the committees of the Association for 1949 follow.

REPORT OF THE TREASURER:—

Account I—General Fund

Investments.....December 15, 1948			$5,500.00
Cash on hand.....December 15, 1948		$2,690.39	
Receipts:			
Annual dues		$5,726.65	
Life memberships		300.00	
Interest from investments		137.50	
Contributions to annual meeting expenses		61.50	
Donations		12.00	
Miscellaneous		3.68	
Total		$8,931.72	$5,500.00
Disbursements:			
Office Expenses:			
Rent of office			
Telephone service.... $ 74.00			
Supplies and sundry services 228.00			
Secretary — salary.. 1,037.82	$1,339.82		
Meeting expenses, 1948	109.30		
Rental of safety deposit box	7.80		
Catholic Historical Review	3,260.00		
Exchange on checks	3.20	4,720.12	
Balance on hand—December 15, 1949		$4,211.60	

Investments—December 15, 1949		$5,500.00
Account II—Revolving Account		
Publication Fund		
Cash on Hand—December 15, 1948		$1,621.36
Receipts:		
United States Ministers to the Papal States	$46.00	
Consular Relations	79.00	125.00
Total Receipts		$1,746.36
Disbursements:		
J. H. Furst Company	$ 4.42	
Total Disbursements		$ 4.42
Cash on hand, December 15, 1949		$1,741.94

* * * * * *

Summary

Investments—Account I		$5,500.00
Cash on hand:		
Account I	$4,211.60	
Account II	1,741.94	
Total cash on hand	$5,953.54	

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN K. CARTWRIGHT, *Treasurer*

Report of the Committee on Nominations:—

The Committee on Nominations submits the following names for officers and committee personnel for 1950 on the basis of returns from the ballot sent out to the membership of the Association and of its own recommendations for the Committees on Program and the John Gilmary Shea Prize:

President—Waldemar Gurian, University of Notre Dame

First Vice President—Paul Levack, Fordham University

Second Vice President—Michael J. Hynes, St. Mary's Seminary, Cleveland

Secretary—John Tracy Ellis, The Catholic University of America

Treasurer—John K. Cartwright, St. Matthew's Cathedral, Washington

Executive Council (for three-year terms): Thomas A. Brady, University of Missouri; John B. Heffernan, Division of Naval Records and History, Navy Department

Committee on Nominations:

William B. Ready, College of St. Thomas, *chairman*

Joseph W. Schmitz, S.M., St. Mary's University
Sister M. Hildegarde Yeager, C.S.C., Dunbarton College

Committee on Program:
James M. Eagan, Lewis College of Science and Technology, *chairman*
Donald P. Gavin, John Carroll University
Clarence J. Ryan, S.J., Marquette University

Committee on the John Gilmary Shea Prize:
Paul Kiniery, Loyola University, Chicago

Respectfully submitted,

P. Raymond Neilson, The Creighton University, *chairman*
Sister M. Rosalita Kelly, I.H.M., Marygrove College
Fergus Macdonald, C.P., St. Gabriel's Monastery, Brighton

Report of the Secretary:—

It has been fourteen years since the Association held its last annual meeting in Boston and, therefore, it is with real pleasure that we return again after so long an absence to renew acquaintance with our friends in the capital of New England.

For the first time since I have had the honor of serving as your secretary I am compelled to report a drop in the Association's membership. At Washington on December 29, 1949, the treasurer, Monsignor Cartwright, informed the Executive Council of a serious decline in income due to the exceedingly high costs of printing the CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW. It was decided by the council at that time that the situation necessitated a raise from $5.00 to $7.00 in the annual dues and a raise from 50c to $1.00 for registration at the annual meetings. As I said in my report of the meeting for 1949, published in the April, 1949, issue of the REVIEW, this change was made with great reluctance, but it was the consensus of the council that until printing costs would show a decrease there was no other alternative for keeping the finances of the Association on a sound basis. The additional revenue which has been taken in as a result of this raise has justified the action of the Executive Council and our present cash balance of $4,211.60, which you just heard read in the report of the treasurer, gives us an increase of $1,521.21 above the cash balance reported a year ago this time. Thus while we lost in membership we have gained in revenue and we will hope that the day is not far distant when we can return to the former figure of $5.00 a year for dues which the Association established at the beginning of its life. Fortunately, the losses suffered by delinquents, resignations, and deaths were in good measure

overtaken by new members and renewals so that our present total of 843 is only ten below last year's figure of 853 members. The details behind this total are as follows:

Membership, December 15, 1948		853
Resignations	27	
Deaths	12	
Delinquents	62	101
		752
Renewals	7	
New Members	84	91
Membership, December 15, 1949		843

This final figure is, as I have said, ten below last year when we showed an increase of forty-five over the total members for 1947, but with the continued support of our present members and others whose interest in our work may be aroused during the coming year, we will hope that a year hence we can regain our losses and by the end of 1950 present an enrollment well over the number of 843. During 1949 we lost twelve members by death as compared to ten in 1948. The following members were called to their eternal reward during the past twelve months:

Reverend Edward A. Breen
Reverend John Canova
Right Reverend John M. Cooper
Mr. John E. Crew
Miss Mary Glennon
Mr. Miecislaus Haiman
Mrs. Frederick H. McDevitt
Reverend James L. McSweeney
Mr. August Oberkampf
Mr. Bernard J. O'Connell
Right Reverend Louis O'Donovan
Right Reverend John E. Sexton

May their souls rest in peace!

The new members and their addresses are as follows:

Albertus Magnus College Library, 700 Prospect Street, New Haven 11, Connecticut

Mr. Ulrich S. Allers, 3310 Dent Place, N. W., Washington 7, D. C.

Sister M. Amata, Mt. Marie Academy, 4824 Tuscarawas Street, West, Canton 8, Ohio

Reverend Edward P. Atzert, S.S., Box 298, Plymouth, Michigan

Reverend Quitman F. Beckley, O.P., Box 321, Princeton, New Jersey

Reverend Joseph U. Bergkamp, O.P., Providence College, Providence, Rhode Island
Mr. George C. A. Boehrer, Marquette University, Milwaukee 3, Wisconsin
Reverend William J. Boldt, 264 North Maine Street, Liberty, New York
Reverend Donald F. Bracht, S.M., 1119 Layfayette Street, Alameda, California
Mr. James F. Breen, 34 K Street, N. W., Washington 1, D. C.
Reverend Henry A. Callahan, S.J., Boston College, Chestnut Hill 67, Massachusetts
Mr. Boyd Carpenter, 4 West Melrose Street, Chevy Chase, Maryland
Mr. John J. Carrigg, 1329 Euclid Avenue, Steubenville, Ohio
Reverend Joseph P. Christopher, Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.
Reverend Herbert J. Clancy, S.J., St. Peter's College, Jersey City 6, New Jersey
Reverend Edward M. Connors, Box 26, Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.
Reverend Thomas P. Conry, S.J., Xavier University, Cincinnati 7, Ohio
Reverend John J. Dougherty, Darlington, Ramsey, New Jersey
President Paul F. Douglass, American University, Washington 6, D. C.
Mr. Joseph L. Druse, Box 458, Collegeville, Indiana
Reverend George H. Dunne, S.J., St. Francis Xavier Church, 4715 North Central Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona
Reverend Gerald E. Dupont, S.S.E., St. Michael's College, Winooski Park, Vermont
Reverend Francis Dvornick, 3101 R. Street, N. W., Washington 7, D. C.
Dr. James M. Eagan, Lewis College of Science and Technology, Lockport, Illinois
Mr. Richard W. Emery, 107-25 132nd Street, Richmond Hill 19, New York
Professor James J. Flynn, Fordham University, 302 Broadway, New York 7, New York
Mr. William M. Gamble, 58 East Cottage Place, York, Pennsylvania
Mr. Herbert L. Ganter, Box 876, Williamsburg, Virginia
Mr. Edward Gargan, 12 Ainsworth Street, Roslindale 31, Massachusetts
Right Reverend Charles L. Giblin, President, Cathedral College, 555 West End Avenue, New York City, 24
Right Reverend Henry F. Graebenstein, 1357 East Capitol Street, Washington 3, D. C.
Mr. William J. Grattan, College of the Holy Cross, Worcester 3, Massachusetts
Dr. John G. Gruber, St. John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota
Reverend James M. Hayes, Box 6423, Washington, D. C.

Most Reverend Charles H. Helmsing, 4510 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis 8, Missouri

Reverend Francis T. Hueller, S.A.C., Queen of Apostles Seminary, Madison 4, Wisconsin

Right Reverend J. Gerald Kealy, 1420 Granville Avenue, Chicago, Illinois

Mr. Frank Kelly, Carroll College, Helena, Montana

Professor Tibor Kerekes, Georgetown University, Washington 7, D. C.

Sister Mary Augustine Kwitchen, 6832 Convent Boulevard, Sylvania, Ohio

Reverend Mark J. Linenberger, O.F.M.Cap., St. Mary's Monastery, Herman, Pennsylvania

Reverend Charles P. Loughran, S.J., Fordham University, New York 58, New York

Most Reverend Robert E. Lucey, 230 Dwyer Avenue, San Antonio 1, Texas

Sister Grace McDonald, O.S.B., College of St. Benedict, St. Joseph, Minnesota

Right Reverend P. J. McGill, St. Joseph's Church, Lakeland, Florida

Most Reverend Joseph T. McGucken, 311 N. Raymond Avenue, Pasadena, California

Mr. William McKiernan, St. Joseph's College, Collegeville, Indiana

Mr. Francis G. McManamin, 1410 Arch Street, Shamokin, Pennsylvania

Reverend Brendan C. McNally, S.J., College of the Holy Cross, Worcester 3, Massachusetts

Most Reverend Martin D. McNamara, 310 Bridge Street, Joliet, Illinois

Reverend Mesceslaus J. Madaj, 5430 Lockwood Avenue, Chicago 38, Illinois

Mr. Lawrence J. Mannion, 70 Monell Avenue, Islip, New York

Right Reverend Thomas F. Markham, 327 Gorham Street, Lowell, Massachusetts

Mr. John F. Martin, 526 North Franklin Street, Gainesville, Florida

Mr. John J. Mitchell, 1902 North Rhodes Street, Arlington, Virginia

Reverend William A. Moore, 3127 James Street, Syracuse 6, New York

Reverend James H. Moynihan, 3817 Pleasant Avenue, Minneapolis 8, Minnesota

Right Reverend Joseph J. Mullen, 1227 Ansel Road, Cleveland 8, Ohio

Reverend Francis T. Newell, Mt. St. Alphonsus, Esopus, New York

Reverend Joseph A. O'Brien, Box 1176, Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Most Reverend William A. O'Connor, 524 East Lawrence Avenue, Springfield, Illinois

Mr. James M. O'Neill, 36 Kenilworth Place, Brooklyn 10, New York

Mr. William A. Osborne, Mt. St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Maryland
Miss Evelene Peters, College of Mt. St. Joseph, Mt. St. Joseph, Ohio
Sister Mary Cortona Phelan, Mount Saint Clare College, Clinton, Iowa
Reverend Russell A. Phelan, 4001 Yuma Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.
University of Portland Library, Portland, Oregon
Professor Ernst Posner, 4116 North Henderson Road, Arlington, Virginia
Reverend W. H. Price, 714 Court Street, P. O. Box 888, Elko, Nevada
Reverend Peter J. Rahill, Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.
Mr. William B. Ready, 1513-75 North Cleveland Street, St. Paul 1, Minnesota
Right Reverend James M. Reardon, 88 N. 17th Street, Minneapolis 3, Minnesota
Reverend Francis Ross, 3728 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia 4, Pennsylvania
Dr. Richard J. Schoeck, 327 Seneca Street, Ithaca, New York
Reverend Albert C. Shannon, O.S.A., Merrimack College, Andover, Massachusetts
Mr. John Shapley, 400 South Capitol Street, Washington 3, D. C.
Southeast Catholic High School, 7th & Christian Streets, Philadelphia 47, Pennsylvania
Very Reverend John S. Spence, 1814 N Street, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.
Mr. Francis X. Steggert, 1429 Lunt Avenue, Chicago 26, Illinois
Reverend Jeremiah B. Sullivan, 650 Grand Concourse, Bronx 51, New York
The Tidings, 3241 South Figueroa Street, Los Angeles 7, California.
Mr. Thaddeus V. Tuleja, 91 Nichol Avenue, New Brunswick, New Jersey
Reverend Robert Wilken, O.F.M., San Felipe Church, Old Albuquerque, New Mexico
Most Reverend John J. Wright, 38 High Street, Worcester, Massachusetts

In my report of a year ago I explained the manner in which the finances of our quarterly journal were conducted and I shall not, therefore, repeat here what was published in the April, 1949, issue of the REVIEW (pp. 51-52). I am happy to say that while the income from the REVIEW is still not as good as we would like to see it, the accounts of the journal were closed for the year on June 30, 1949, with a surplus of $296.25 which was due, of course, to the increased revenue which the Association was able to give to the REVIEW from the individual members' annual fees. As to the distribution of the journal we have at present a total of 438 subscriptions, 124 exchanges, and 843 who get the REVIEW through their membership dues. This makes a total figure of 1405 to whom our journal goes out each quarter, an increase of ten over the total figure reported to you at this time last year. Since the number of exchanges has de-

creased by eleven from those of 1948 it means that there has been an increase in subscriptions of thirty-one over a year ago. I might say that some of our members in dropping out of the Association entered a subscription to the REVIEW and these doubtless account for quite a number among the increased subscriptions.

During the year 1949 there was a total of twenty-one manuscripts received for the consideration of the editors of the REVIEW. Of these fifteen were rejected, two have been accepted for future publication, one is as yet undecided, and three have already appeared. The percentage of rejections is still high but we have had sufficient comment from our readers to lead us to believe that our editorial policies in this regard meet with their satisfaction. Were it not that we are held to a limit of 128 pages per issue we could publish more manuscripts than we do, but as long as the REVIEW continues to operate on so slender a margin of profit it would seem the part of wisdom to hold down its size in a way that will enable us to live within our income.

The Committe on the John Gilmary Shea Prize presented no book or manuscript during 1949 which they felt worthy to receive the annual prize, but we will all hope that the coming year will produce a work in the history of the Church that will merit the award, as it is now three years since it has been granted.

There were 135 ballots returned by members in voting for new officers and committees of the Association for 1950 which, of course, is far from a majority of those enrolled in our ranks but yet it represents a fair return. I would urge you all to send in your ballots each December so that we may have as wide a sampling of the opinions of the membership in this matter as we possibly can.

In closing I wish to enter a special vote of thanks to Mr. Allan J. Doherty of the Boston Latin School and his two colleagues, Father Joseph N. Moody of Cathedral College, New York, and John Perry Pritchett of Queens College, for their splendid work in arranging the details for our program here in Boston. This committee took full control of the program after a preliminary meeting in New York last January and during the ensuing months, under Mr. Doherty's leadership, they carried out all the exacting and time-consuming details connected with the assignment. Not only did Mr. Doherty bear the burden of most of the correspondence with the speakers, discussion leaders, and chairmen of the various sessions but he likewise supervised the publicity for the meeting in the Boston area which, I think you will agree, has been quite beyond the normal amount of notice which the Association has received in the press in recent years. For all these services, then, I am confident I voice your sentiments when I tell him that we are deeply grateful. We are thankful, too, to the members who pre-

pared the papers which we will hear during the next two days, to the discussion leaders, and to the chairmen of the sessions. It is only through the self-sacrifice entailed in assignments of this kind that we can offer each year to our audiences a series of stimulating and profitable discussions on topics of value to the history of the Church. Finally, I wish to thank Professor Nielson and his Committee on Nominations for their kindness in performing for the Association the duty apportioned to them, and to the officials of the Hotel Statler we are also grateful for their more than ordinary courtesies and their splendid arrangements for our comfort and enjoyment. I shall close as I have done in former years by wishing you all a blessed and happy new year and by expressing the hope that a year hence you may find it possible to be with us at the Hotel Stevens in Chicago for our annual meeting of 1950.

Respectfully submitted,

John Tracy Ellis, *Secretary*

THE NEED FOR THE STUDY OF AMERICAN CHURCH HISTORY*

By

Richard J. Cushing

Archbishop of Boston

Your convention comes to its conclusion today and so let me begin by bidding you Godspeed in the hope that your stay has been pleasant and your deliberations profitable. My remarks this noon will be brief and practical. The presidential address of Professor Lucas is naturally eagerly awaited and I do not wish to deprive him of a moment's time.

When first Mr. Doherty, chairman of your Committee on Program, invited me to appear it was suggested that I might make a plea for increased emphasis on the study of American Church history. The best way to begin the fulfillment of that task is by a plea for increased research and writing. The first fact is that we do not have a sufficient number of Catholic American scholars engaged in recording and interpreting the life, thought, and action of the Church in these United States. We do not have anywhere near the number of possible and needed histories—histories, for example, of the various racial or national groups who have had a part in the life of the American Church; of the archdioceses and dioceses of the country; of the principal schools or colleges; of the major religious orders or notable Catholic organizations.

No one recognizes better than I the reasons for this lack of scientific writing in the field of American Church history. First of all, the universal practical explanation of more than half our difficulties is particularly pertinent in this case: we simply do not have the money needed for extensive scientific research. Then, too, we do not have a sufficient number of trained scholars and those whom we have are cruelly over-burdened. Perhaps, finally, we do not have a sufficiently earnest desire to secure the money and dedicate it to these purposes, and to train scholars so that they may dedicate themselves to a work so important.

I suggest that we begin by the correction of this third situation, if it truly exists. The old adage "where there's a will, there's a way" undoubtedly holds in this connection as in most others. And so, let me urge the American Catholic Historical Association to make it a principal preoccupation to instill and to intensify as best you can the general desire to see American Church history scientifically explored and effectively committed to writing.

Here in the Archdiocese of Boston we have attempted to meet in some

*This paper was read at the luncheon conference of the American Catholic Historical Association, Boston, December 30, 1949.

modest measure our responsibility in this regard. Under the patronage of His Eminence, the late Cardinal O'Connell, three of our most competent priest-scholars, headed by your distinguished associate Father Robert Lord, produced a most ambitious three-volume *History of the Archdiocese of Boston.* Our historians worked under several very real handicaps. In the first place, all three of them were carrying unreasonably heavy teaching schedules. Moreover, in many chapters of the work they were embarrassed by the inevitable problems which arise from the discussion of policies and programs of living persons. They, too, were not without financial worries. But they produced a history of which we may, I think, be pardonably proud and in so doing they provided an example which might well be followed elsewhere in the United States in the interest both of scholarship and of the Church.

One of our seminary priests has been engaged for the past few years in the preparation of a scientific history of the St. Vincent de Paul Society. Another of our diocesan priests, Father Arthur J. Riley, is presently being released from parochial duties in order to undertake the systematic writing of the national and international history of the Knights of Columbus in fulfillment of a project sponsored by the Knights themselves. I might profit by this occasion to ask the co-operation with this venture of all the scholars here present from various parts of the country. Here locally we have seen the publication within the last few years of a history of Boston College by one of the Jesuit Fathers. There have also been several minor but on the whole valuable histories of individual parishes, organizations, and movements.

I mention these efforts as examples of what has been and can be done—what must be done—if we are to meet our obligations of gratitude to the past and guidance to the future. As a matter of fact, however, so far as the scientific writing of the history of the Church in the United States goes our historians have hardly done more than scratch the surface. A few single volumes exist, and for them we are only too grateful to their authors. But most even of these chiefly serve to make us more conscious than ever of how little has been done and of how very great, indeed, is the need for increased research and more intensified scientic writing of the local and national chapters of the history of the American Church.

When Theodore Maynard undertook with rare courage and great good will the writing of his single volume, *The Story of American Catholicism,* he began his introduction with this observation: "'The Catholic Church,' wrote John Gilmary Shea, 'is the oldest organization in the United States and the only one that has retained the same life and polity and forms through each succeeding age.' Yet it has received, although by far the largest and most vigorous of religious bodies in America, as a rule per-

functory and even slighting notice in most of the standard general histories" (p. ix).

My complaint, however, is with our *own* limited contribution to the literature of American Catholic history. Of course, much of our writing in this field has been polemical or directly linked to the defense of the Church. This was probably inevitable, given the practical problems, far from settled even now, arising from the nativism which confronted the Church from the very beginning in many parts of America.

We cannot even glance through a book like Billington's *Protestant Crusade* without realizing sadly that for an indefinite period after the nineteenth century Catholic historians here in the United States would have their hands full simply uprooting the acres of cockle sowed by the hostile in the American scene. Before we could have legal or even physical security for our schools, for example, scores of men who might otherwise have developed into first-class historians had to spend enormous energy and time in the largely negative and, therefore, wasteful, but nonetheless necessary, work of discussing ten thousand things that French Catholics and Spanish Catholics did not do, rather than recording what they did do; of exonerating Catholics from complicity in almost every disaster in American history from an escapade or two in the youthful life of George Washington through the assassination of Abraham Lincoln down to the tensions incidental to the American entrance into World War II, not excluding the Chicago fire.

We have been obliged, as the sad price for being able to function in the community in any respect, to devote too much time to the correction of false notions concerning the intents and purposes of the religious orders, the hierarchy, and the entire Church. I submit that the time has come for a much more positive approach: for less Maria Monk and more Mother Seton, Rose Hawthorne, Isaac Hecker, and the galaxy of saints, scholars, and great citizens who have provided such abundant material for scientific American Church history.

My remarks on the need for study of American Church history would be incomplete if I did not say a special word about assigning a much more important place in the curricula of our schools to the study by young Catholic Americans of the history of their own Church in their own country. I am led to believe that there is very little formal organization to the courses given in American Catholic history in our universities, seminaries, colleges, high and elementary schools. If so, this must be accounted a very grave deficiency. I am told that there is on the market no scholarly manual for use as a textbook, though I believe a Capuchian Father is presently at work on this problem. In the elementary schools acquaintance with the Catholic aspects of American history is haphazard, incidental, and even negligible. One can hardly expect elementary teach-

ers to be prepared to transmit American Church history to their pupils if the Catholic universities, seminaries, colleges, and teacher training schools do not provide adequate basic courses in Catholic American history.

In this connection I feel bound to make a three-fold plea. First, that our historians be alerted to the grave danger in which our children stand of growing up totally unaware of a proud heritage which should be contributing to their perfection both as Catholics and as citizens. Indeed, there is even the danger that, not merely deprived of positive knowledge of their heritage, they may be afflicted with a serious defect both in spiritual and in civic resources by reason of the perverted presentation to them of a misleading or even false account of their heritage and its relation to the epic of America. I ask you to meditate very carefully how likely it is that federal or other commissions on textbooks or curricula will be any more fair to Catholic children in the matter of dispensing information than they have proved to be in the matter of dispensing other benefits so long as they are dominated by completely secular or indifferentist mentalities and include, as they do, recognized anti-Catholics.

Secondly, surely in our own schools and colleges the field of American Church history ought to be considered an area worthy of separate treatment and separate study. Not merely should a formal course in the religious history of the United States be included in the curriculum, but there should be a very generous opportunity for reading and reflection on what George N. Shuster called the "Catholic Spirit in America." Our students will be stunted, indeed, if they fail to catch that spirit—and their education for life in the American community will be truly defective if they do not absorb that spirit in its legitimate relationship to the general American scene.

Finally, in the teaching of American history itself, we should integrate for our students any significant aspects of the Church's thought and action, especially on the level of political idealism, social progress, economic reform, and diplomatic efforts toward peace, prosperity, and international organization. The apologetic value of all this is obvious enough, too obvious to need mention or development. That value will be increased rather than diminished the less it is emphasized and the more it is subordinated to a sincerely scientific, scholarly spirit.

I am afraid I have spent more time on this subject than I intended to do. But I plead the importance of the matter as my excuse and I urge that you yourselves devote a major portion of your society's future thought and action to the further development of the points I have tried to make. Nowhere in the world has the Church a more promising history than here in the United States. Nowhere in the world has she a better chance to live out her history constructively and courageously. Nowhere can she record it so freely and so fairly, with greater pride within the household of the faith or better opportunity to be heard by those outside the fold.

THE HISTORIAN IN THE SERVICE OF PEACE*

JOHN J. WRIGHT
BISHOP OF WORCESTER

I count it a privilege to speak to you on the particular subject assigned to me, "The Historian in the Service of Peace." I assume that we are all equally aware of the unhappy fact that peace remains an object of wistful longing rather than of confident enjoyment. The dawn of the mid-century year still finds the forces which work for division as active and as powerful as ever they have been in our times, more active, one still fears, than the forces which work for peace.

These respective forces vary but little from generation to generation. Vocabularies and nomenclature change and so do the alignments of states and regimes. But the causes of war remain constant, and equally permanent are the principles of peace. The antagonisms which constitute "cold war" and which lead to armed differences still polarize around the centrifigal loyalties which divide mankind into conflicting cultural, racial, or national camps. The fairest hopes which nourish the dream of peace are those which aspire after some centripetal social loyalties capable of transcending national, racial, or cultural lines and thus achieving a human community, a world organized in peace because united by common bonds.

Division is the work of men. Unity is the will of God. The divisions fostered by men yield their fruit in war. The unity commanded by God has peace for its social corollary. Both spring from intellect—division from the conflicting counsels which are the thoughts of men, unity from the single thought which is the plan of God. Thus in the historical order are fulfilled the words of Scripture: "The thoughts of men are many, that of God is one. My thoughts, said the Lord, are thoughts of peace and not of affliction." Thoughts are the stock in trade of the scholar. Hence the reliance of those who seek peace on all who as scholars write or speak or teach or otherwise influence thought. Historians particularly, it seems to me, are bound by an obligation to be peacemakers, an obligation flowing from the peculiar power of their thoughts to inflame or to discipline national and other group passions.

Dr. Herbert C. F. Bell, in his presidential address in 1937 before the eighteenth annual meeting of your Association, discussed the obligations of Catholic historians in a world where loyalties are turned into divisive instruments and history is used of set purpose to make nations into bitter enemies. Dr. Bell's observations, made on the eve of World War II twelve years ago, are well worth repeating now that the war has ended

*The address of Bishop Wright was prepared for delivery at the luncheon conference of the American Catholic Historical Association, Boston, December 29, 1949.

without any appreciable correction of the conditions which produced it. Having sketched the manner in which human loyalties had been perverted by the totalitarian regimes of the pre-war period, he declared:

> Considering all this, it seems to me that one obligation which rests on Catholic historians stands out clearly. In a world where loyalty is turned into an instrument which helps to darken men's intellects and souls; to reconcile them to the loss of all freedom; to make nations and even groups of fellow citizens into bitter enemies, Catholic historians must do their best to see that loyalty comes into proper use again. They must strive to see that it is placed at the service of Christian civilization and the institutions by which Christian civilization is exemplified; and they must strive most of all to see that the services and the real principles of the Church are understood by Catholics and non-Catholics alike. They must bring back to Christendom the realization that the Church, apart even from its divine nature, is in the highest sense an institution of international utility; that it offers practical reconciliation between order and freedom, patriotism and worldwide brotherhood, tradition and adaptability to men's present needs. Such, indeed, is the duty of every educated Catholic; but it is the very special duty of Catholic historians. For who does not know the power of history to deepen loyalty? The enemies of Christianity know it so well that they have been at the greatest pains to distort history in their service.[1]

If a layman, Dr. Bell, pleaded as he did for historians to emphasize the historical role of the Church as an agent for peace and as herself a bond of unity in the peaceful society then, perhaps, it is appropriate that a priest make, as I now do, the plea that history utilize every level of nature and grace, every aspect of the history not only of the Church, but of civil society as well in order to provide ever more and ever stronger bonds of human unity. The historian will properly point out the powerful, the unique energies which the Gospel and the earthly City of God bring to forging the unity of mankind. But he will no less certainly prompt his students to reflect on the myriad ways in which the City of Man and the universal voice of reason cries out for human unity, and he will realize that in the building of peace, in the organization of a sane international order as in all things else *gratia perficit naturam sed opus naturae prius condendum est.*

In order to enter the service of peace, history, as Lord Acton observed, must be made our deliverer not only from the influence of other times, but from the undue influence of our own, from the tyranny of environment and the pressure of the air we breathe. It must help promote the faculty of resistance to merely contemporary surroundings, however compelling, providing a saving familiarity with other ages and other orbits of thought.

If historical studies are so to function unto the liberation of humanity from divisive influences and as a means to the peaceful unity of the race,

[1] Herbert C. F. Bell, "The Place of History in Catholic Education," *Catholic Historical Review,* XXIII (January, 1938), 415.

then somehow there must be achieved a happy blend of the scientific and the humanistic spirit in the writing, the teaching, and the study of history. The scientific spirit will be preserved by Catholic historians who render prompt and complete obedience to the admonitions of Pope Leo XIII in his famous letter on historical studies of 1883 when he quoted Cicero in saying: ". . . the first law of history is not to dare to utter falsehood; the second, not to fear to speak the truth; and, moreover, no room must be left for suspicion of partiality or prejudice. . . ."

The humanistic spirit is less easy to define. Moreover, in our age of arid *Wissenschaft* on the one hand and the sweating rhetoric of propaganda on the other, it is even more difficult to achieve. Perhaps, however, it is likewise among the modern Popes that we will find apt formulae for the development of a worthy humanism in all teaching, and particularly in teaching the historical sciences in the service of peace. Obviously if we are to integrate the letter of strict science with the spirit of sane humanism, we must make a distinction between education considered as mere instruction or factual stocking of the mind and education considered in the full sense of the harmonious development of all the faculties distinctive of man.

The late Pope Pius XI added to his declarations on the devotional and sacramental means to the establishment of the peace of Christ in the reign of Christ an observation which might well be the watch-word of the historian in the service of peace: "We now add that this reign can be brought to pass on earth in no other way than by the labor and industry of the Church engaged in the word of educating men." The Church is engaged in the work of educating men when she speaks authoritatively through the Supreme Pontiff or the hierarchy in communion with him. She is engaged in the work of educating men when she interprets or defines through the councils or the ordinary channels of her teaching. But she is also engaged, in due measure, in the work of educating men when she expounds or explains or records or reflects through her scholars, her professors, her poets, her scientists, her historians. Hence the crucial importance that our historians be themselves motivated by Christian humanism as well as the scientific spirit and that they transmit to those whose personalities they shape a truly humane as well as scientific understanding of themselves, their race, and their world.

Purely secular attempts to educate for internationalism have suffered almost as much from their lack of genuine humanism as they have from the lack of supernatural elements; indeed, the two defects are interrelated. No one will have an adequate understanding of human personality or human history who lacks an appreciation of their spiritual elements and the very talk of spiritual matters speedily becomes gaseous unless it be firmly founded on an understanding of that pure Spirit which is God.

In the period between World War I and World War II much honest but inadequate effort went into attempts to provide some species of education for what was called "worldmindedness." It would be unjust, very unjust indeed, to offer World War II as necessary evidence of the futility of these efforts, but it is the part of truth to declare that they were foredoomed to failure. It is not merely the absence of any creed concerning God which vitiates most such studies in international relations; it is also the absence of any concept of man, of the tremendous possibilities as well as the pathetic limitations of man's nature and of human personality which precludes their effectiveness.

A typical survey of such educational efforts is provided by John E. Harley in his book *International Understanding*, published by the Stanford University Press in 1931. Completely secular in its emphasis, Harley's study provides what he apparently considers an exhaustive list of those educational, social, athletic, and recreational interests which, he tells us, "will train an élite to think, feel and act internationally." God finds no place among the interests listed—but neither does the study of man, which was once announced to be the proper study of those interested in mankind. Significantly enough, neither is there any place given to a philosophy of history as a means of training an élite "to think, feel and act internationally."

The Catholic historian will not be surprised by such an omission from a list of interests which does not include either God or man. For him, again as for Acton, philosophy and history, indeed history and theology, will always reflect reciprocal light on one another. Said Acton: "History will aid you to see that the action of Christ who is risen on mankind whom he redeemed fails not, but increases; that the wisdom of divine rule appears not in the perfection but in the improvement of the world. . . . Then you will understand what a famous philosopher said, that History is the true demonstration of Religion."

And so education, if it is to produce citizens of the world in any civilized sense must be scientific. But it must also be spiritual and, therefore, truly humane. Historical studies provide in many respects the most important means of making it both. Typical of the divisions underlying the antagonisms of "cold war" and the brutalities of armed conflict are those identified during these recent centuries with aggressive nationalism. Aggressive nationalism has been the product of education, and no course in the curriculum of modern schools has done more to propagate false nationalism than has the teaching and study of history; conversely no course can render more effective help in correcting the excesses of pagan nationalism and in promoting the wider loyalties which make for peace than the same study of history.

Carlton J. H. Hayes points out lucidly in his *Essays on Nationalism*

how divisive nationalism is a cultural phenomenon, not at all physical. It is not "in the blood"; it cannot be transmitted biologically from one person to another; it is an "acquired character" and the method of its acquisition, as of any cultural product, is education. Hayes likewise confirms the contention that the most dangerous zone of infection is the history classroom. A wise Frenchman, appealing for a more widespread emphasis on God's part in history and on the broadly human aspects of the pageant of history, speaks of the appalling damage done by *l'histoire dirigée* which has been the principal weapon of the nationalist and the imperialist in promoting divisive loyalties in modern times. His conclusions are confirmed by a typical investigation into the history courses provided national groups which was carried on by a commission of German and French historians who met in 1935; a translation of their findings was published in the *American Historical Review* of January, 1938. Like evidence concerning the causes of international and interracial hatred in children has been supplied through the joint study of Baumgarten and Prescott in the *Journal of Educational Psychology* of May, 1928.

He is a blind jingoist, indeed, who fails to recognize to what a great extent our American children have become the victims of a no less crass if usually less militaristic *histoire dirigée*. Surely we can somehow improve certain emphases in our history classes and thus do our part in helping build a more humane world order by developing in our children an historical perspective which includes some glimpse of all the earth against the background of eternity. Our children must think of local or national elections in 1920 or 1932 or 1948 or 1952 in terms of the places these years will have in the total story of mankind. There must be less thinking of the history of the world in terms of 1066 and 1215 as mere preparations for 1492 and 1620—as these dates in turn were simply preparations for 1776 and 1812 and the other great years which brought history to its logical culmination in Lake Success, Radio City, the Chicago World's Fair, and the Little Church Around the Corner.

Somehow we must manage to teach the history of every local wonder and national way in terms of the great human adventure. We must give our students a healthy pride in their own particular bypath or pilgrimage under the stars, but at the same time we must develop their sense of the broad highway of history—of the place of their tribe or nation in the human caravan as, having set forth from God in the beginning, it finds its way back to Him at the last, through all the slow stages, the blunders and blessings of the mysteries joyful, sorrowful, and glorious which are the stuff of history.

BOOK REVIEWS

GENERAL CHURCH HISTORY

The History of the Primitive Church. By JULES LEBRETON, S.J. and JACQUES ZEILLER. Translated from the French by Ernest C. Messenger. Two Volumes. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1949. Pp. 1272, paged continuously. $16.50.)

The original French edition of this work was reviewed here in 1938 (*Catholic Historical Review,* XXIII, 477-480). In the present translation apparently no account has been taken of the observations made at that time. Messenger's translation was published in England from 1942 to 1947 in four half-volumes, of which the first and fourth were reviewed in this journal, [XXIX, (1943), 292 and XXXIV (1948), 224-225]. The text of this American edition remains unchanged except for the pagination. There is one displacement: the general bibliography is now found incongruously in the middle of Volume I. A very full index, which was noticeably lacking in the French edition, has been added at the end of Volume II. The title *Primitive Church* was confined to the first volume in French (up to A.D. 180), but has been extended to cover both volumes in English, carrying the story up to the meeting of Constantine and Licinius at Milan in 312.

The external aspects of the history of the Church are handled by Professor Zeiller in a much more extended form than in his previous synthetic work, *L'empire romain et l'église* (1928). He divides his matter into four main categories: the propagation of Christianity in its geographical extension; its relations with the Roman state; the organization and material resources of the Church; and, finally, a section called "Christian Life," or the problem of adapting Christian living to a pagan society. These chapters on Christian social life, including problems of military service, of slavery, and of business, are the most original and interesting. Considerable space is devoted to discussion of the legal basis for the early persecutions and the status of church property, both of which will have to be compared with Gerda Krüger's work, *Die Rechtsstellung der vorkonstantinischen Kirchen* (Stuttgart, 1935). The detailed treatment of the geographical expansion of Christianity emphasizes, by contrast, the complete absence of maps in the translation.

All the aspects of internal Church history and of theological development are handled by Père Lebreton, largely on the lines of his *Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ* and his monumental *Histoire du dogme de la Trinité.* Exceptionally full treatment is given to the teachings of Christ and to the first generation of Christianity as depicted in the New Testament. This is followed by equally detailed chapters on the doctrinal teachings of the apostolic fathers, the apologists, Irenaeus, Origen, and on the

major heretical movements. In fact, the distinguishing feature of the work as a whole is the extended treatment devoted to questions of theology and the development of dogmas. There are occasional discrepancies of opinion between the two authors, e.g., in regard to the Christianity of Bardesanes. A few of their conclusions are also open to question, e.g., the legal basis of the persecutions before Decius and the dating of the works of Commodianus in the third century.

This work has now no single rival in English as a general history of the early Church. Lebreton and Zeiller have outstripped the corresponding works of Kirsch, Krüger, Duchesne, and Kidd in both scope and competence. Their work is approached, at the moment, only by Hans Lietzmann's *Geschichte der alten Kirche* which is as yet only partially translated into English.

The translation has been executed with a high degree of accuracy. A few brief notes and some bibliographical items have been added by the translator, but in general the bibliographies remain as they were in 1935. They may be described as fundamental rather than exhaustive. Some objection may be made against the use of Challoner's version of the New Testament in a work of this caliber, even though the translator has occasionally amended the text.

The American publisher has improved the typography and general appearance of the book over the English printing. For future editions, however, some maps and archeological illustrations, similar to those of the Italian translation, would be a great improvement.

FRANCIS GLIMM

Immaculate Conception Seminary
Huntington

The Photian Schism: History and Legend. By FRANCIS DVORNIK. (Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Macmillan Co. 1948. Pp. xii, 503. $7.50.)

In this very fine work Dvornik does away with the old personal and historical estimate of Photius and presents him in an entirely new light—a rehabilitation that will undoubtedly endure.

That Photius was the real author of the Greek schism, that in his overweening ambition he stopped at no cruelty or deceit to gain the See of Constantinople and even dreamt of making himself head of the universal Church, that he senselessly provoked a second quarrel and died estranged from Rome—all this Dvornik convincingly refutes while he depicts for us a noble character that should receive from the West the admiration it has always been accorded in the East. For Dvornik, Photius was the one man eminently qualified by his personal prestige, his magnanimous out-

look, and his broad statesmanship to reconcile the bitter religious strife, with its dangerous political repercussions, between extremists and moderates, a residue of the iconoclastic controversy. In this task, the unworldly Patriarch Ignatius had signally failed; manoeuvred into the extremist camp, he found himself innocently involved in a plot against the throne and, realizing his own inadequacy, he resigned. Photius, promoted reluctantly to the vacant see, won the approval of all save five of the hierarchy and the backing of a substantial minority among the monks. The legates of Pope Nicholas I perceived the true state of affairs and this is why, in the synod of 861, they exceeded their orders merely to collect evidence and instead pronounced sentence of deposition against Ignatius. Though not objecting to their action, the Pope still withheld his approval of Photius in the hope thus to force the Emperor Michael III to restore to Rome's jurisdiction the territory removed by the iconoclastic emperors. But this included Bulgaria and, as Byzantium could not tolerate a foreign cultural influence on its very doorstep, the Pope's letters remained unanswered. Meantime, prejudiced against Photius by the calumnious reports of Theognostus, a die-hard extremist, the Pope in a Roman synod of 863 condemned Photius in the most unmeasured language. Nevertheless, he still held out hopes of a reversal of the decision, provided his terms were met. In 864, however, the emperor induced Boris of Bulgaria to receive baptism in Constantinople and Photius despatched missionaries there. But two years later Boris suddenly turned to Rome. Filled with alarm and unable at the moment to exercise military pressure, the emperor summoned a general council of the Orient which, under the leadership of Photius, condemned the distinctive western practices, such as the celibacy of the clergy which had caused controversy in Bulgaria, and deposed Nicholas I for exceeding his rights. It was hoped by threat of excommunication of so august a gathering to counterbalance the authority of the Pope and thus press Boris back into the fold of Constantinople; there was no intention either to deny the primacy or to damn all western Christendom. With the assassination of Michael by Basil I, however, Photius was soon afterwards deposed and the new ruler submitted the whole case to the Pope, now Hadrian II. The eighth general council reinstated Ignatius, condemned Photius and his followers, and annulled all his acts and synods. But Photius gained the esteem of Basil and, to promote the peace of the Church, not only became friends himself with Ignatius but prevented his supporters from starting any trouble. This moderate and conciliatory attitude made him the almost unanimous choice for the patriarchate upon Ignatius' death. John VIII, successor to Hadrian, concurred and in the synod of rehabilitation of 879-880 cancelled the eighth general council and all others held against Photius. Photius settled the touchy question of Bulgaria to Rome's satisfaction by the compromise that the clergy should

be Greek but subject to the Holy See like those in southern Italy. The two Churches then lived in harmony until Photius' resignation in 886—on such good terms, in fact, that Pope Stephen V, until he had assured himself of the freedom of the abdication, would not acknowledge any successor.

In the second part of his book, "The Legend," Dvornik traces the growth of the received estimate of Photius (to be found, e.g., in Fortescue's article in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*) and shows it up as pure legend. It originated no earlier than the *Annals* of Baronius who put implicit faith in the anti-Photianist collection. Yet this was compiled by the bitterest enemy of Photius; the whole narrative is violently distorted by prejudice and many of its documents are forgeries. In the East it was not until the thirteenth century that Photius came to be regarded as the hero of the separatists, and even then it was the partisans of union who contributed most to that development. With reference to the councils, Dvornik shows that the eighth is not mentioned by any papal profession of faith prior to the twelfth century, and that its unequivocal acceptance came first in the canonists and dates only from Gratian (c. 1150). It has, of course, never been acknowledged by the Greeks. On the other hand, though the Orthodox theologians have often counted the synod of rehabilitation of 879-880 as ecumenical, it has never been officially declared such by the Byzantine Church.

Every statement of Dvornik's is thoroughly documented and the second part of his book provides a powerful confirmation of his thesis. Still, one might hesitate to follow him in all particulars. Thus, e.g., in the question of Ignatius' resignation, the commission appointed by the eighth general council reported: "We do not believe that any resignation was ever tendered; and if it was tendered, we cannot accept it, since it was wrongly forced on him by violence and against his will." This seems to show pretty conclusively that no signed abdication had ever been gotten from Ignatius, so the alleged resignation must have been oral. It was said to have been made during his imprisonment on the isle of Terebinthos but, as the commission points out, if such an act ever occurred (the only witnesses were administration supporters and avowed enemies of Ignatius), it was incontestable that it lacked freedom. On the other hand, Ignatius flatly denied that he had ever resigned. In short, the commission examined the issue from the point of view of Photius' legitimacy and concluded that there was (1) no proof of the fact of resignation, and (2) no presumption whatever of the validity of the alleged resignation. It seems difficult to find any juridical flaw in that decision. Dvornik cites a number of sources, but they are hearsay, not evidence; they prove that practically everyone in Constantinople (including, no doubt, Photius) believed the rumor of the resignation but when it came down to proof, there was none.

Again, Dvornik argues that Nicholas' primary reason for not recognizing Photius was to regain Bulgaria, and he bases this conclusion on a letter of John VIII: "For it was on this condition that Ignatius was acquitted by our predecessors, that if he undertook anything against apostolic rights in connection with Bulgaria, which not even Photius ever dared to attempt, he would, despite his acquittal, remain under the sentence of his previous condemnation." The passage refers to Ignatius' disobedience of Hadrian's command after the eighth general council not to exercise jurisdiction in Bulgaria. Although Photius had been in 864 the first to assume ecclesiastical charge of Bulgaria and send missionaries there, yet John VIII says that "he never dared to violate apostolic rights." How could such an assertion be made if the whole aim of Nicholas' policy had been to keep the Greeks out of Bulgaria? No, the claim of the Holy See on Bulgaria obviously, in John's mind, dates from the despatch of the Latin clergy by Pope Nicholas in 866, as does the determination to make Ignatius' reinstatement contingent upon his request for that claim. On the other hand, there is not a syllable in Nicholas' own correspondence to substantiate Dvornik's theory, and the Pope's conduct is readily explained otherwise. He had determined from the first to settle the case in Rome and would not sanction his legates' disobedience. He did not punish it because he supposed them in good faith. Filled with indignation, however, at Theognostus' story of the cruel injustice done Ignatius he waited, nevertheless, until it was clear that Constantinople intended to ignore his letters and only then condemned Photius by default. He also excommunicated his legates partly because Theognostus' testimony had put their action in a very reprehensible light and partly to emphasize his repudiation of the council of 861. He realized, however, that to judge a man without a hearing was arbitrary and he made repeated overtures to Photius to reopen the case. What is most significant is that the Bulgarian incident made no discernible change in his attitude since he offered to review the sentence as well after as before.

Again, to say that John VIII "cancelled" the eighth general council is, it seems to me, too strong a term for his rather grudging acquiescence in the decision of the synod of rehabilitation. His words to Photius were: "We also approve what has been done in mercy for your reinstatement by the decree of the synod of Constantinople, and, if our legates should have acted against apostolic instructions, we do not approve their action and we attach no value to it." The second clause is merely a mild way of saying: "We disapprove all that our legates did against our orders." The Pope had insisted upon their acting upon their own responsibility and did not wish now to rebuke them, but he plainly insinuates his dissatisfaction with some of the things they had done. The first clause is clearly intended as a restriction to his approval: he approves only so far as necessary to rein-

state Photius and only what has been done "in mercy." In other words, he agrees to the extent of dispensing Photius from life-long censure and suspension and thus enabling him to occupy his former office, but no farther. This interpretation seems supported by the event; Rome apparently never acknowledged the legitimacy of Photius' first patriarchate. However, the name of Photius occurs frequently in the acts of the eighth general council, and the vagueness of John's statement would leave in uncertainty the status of these canons, at least until they were officially re-edited. This accounts for the hesitation about the council for so many centuries.

The above exceptions to some of Dvornik's conclusions do not shake his main thesis. He has forever discredited the fable that has up to the present passed for history, whether we accept every detail of his warm championship of Photius or not. This striking result he has achieved by his illuminating portrayal of the political and ecclesiastical environment in which arose the misunderstanding that has been so erroneously called the Photian Schism.

MARTIN J. HIGGINS

The Catholic University of America

Studi Gregoriani. Volume III. Edited by G. BORINO. (Rome: Abbazia di San Paolo di Roma. 1948. Pp. viii, 516. L. 4,000.)

The original purpose of Father Borino, the editor of the *Studi Gregoriani,* was to publish a single volume commemorating the ninth centenary of Gregory VII's first appearance in history. But so unexpected was the response to his appeal that to the two books appearing in 1947 another had to be added in 1948.

This third volume contains fourteen essays—six in German, five in Italian, and one each in English, French, and Spanish. It reveals the same variety of subjects as the preceding studies. Two articles concern the early career of Gregory VII. H. Mikoletzky shows little sympathy with Hildebrand and minimizes the importance of his missions to France and Germany, as well as his part in drawing up the famous decree on papal elections in 1059. Borino challenges Mikoletzky on many points. He proves by a careful analysis of the contemporaneous documents that the title of archdeacon, which Hildebrand had received from Nicholas II, was a well deserved tribute to his diplomatic skill and his single-minded devotion to the cause of ecclesiastical reform.

R. Morchen, A. Stickler, and P. Zerbi concentrate on Gregory's political theories. They are agreed that he was inspired by the highest spiritual ideals and never abandoned them, even though at times he antagonized some of his supporters. The Pontiff's relations with Spain and Ireland are also

treated. According to L. de la Calzada a major achievement of his pontificate was the restoration of Spain to cultural and religious unity with western Christendom. J. Vincke points out that papal legates were soon able to eliminate the "Eigenkirchenrecht" in Catalonia and Aragon. Father Gwynn, S.J., offers documentary proof that Gregory was far better informed about Irish ecclesiastical affairs than has been commonly supposed.

Father Dereine, S. J., cites the opinion of the canonists from Anselm of Lucca to Gratian on the canonical life, which bulks so largely in the history of the eleventh century, while M. Giusti shows how it was adopted throughout the Diocese of Lucca. A. Michel devotes two articles to his favorite subject, the famous Cardinal Humbert. W. Smidt discusses the *Historia Normannorum* of Amatus, an invaluable item of source material for the pontificates of Leo XI and Gregory VII. W. Wühr writes about Richer, an abbot of Montecassino (*ca.* 1035-1055), who certainly deserves a full length biography.

Borino promises that a supplement with a thorough index to the three volumes, and an up-to-date bibliography on Gregory VII and the Gregorian Reform will soon appear. He also informs us that the Abbot of St. Paul's Monastery in Rome has agreed to publish similar books on this same subject. "Invito dunque gli studiosi alla callaborazione" (p. vii). It is to be hoped that American scholars will accept this gracious invitation. In spite of the fact that the *Studi Gregoriani* contain more than 1,500 pages there are still many problems about Gregory VII and his times that have not been touched upon or adequately treated.

STEPHEN MCKENNA

St. Clement's Mission House
Ephrata, Pennsylvania

Henry VIII and the Reformation. By H. MAYNARD SMITH. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1948. Pp. xv, 480. $8.50.)

This is a sequel to the author's highly acclaimed *Pre-Reformation England.* Anyone acquainted with that outstanding work will welcome this new book and will not be disappointed, for though not the result of original reseach, it is a monument of wide and careful reading, written in an enlivening, brisk, and witty style.

The book is divided into two parts: the political reformation and the religious reformation. The first part is the more important and for Catholics the more satisfactory. Henry VIII naturally dominates the political scene. He was the supreme head of the Church as well as of the State and he ruled them both on strictly Machiavellian principles. He pretended to be something of a theologian but dogma or morals were never

allowed to interfere with his political schemes. His subjects, whether wives or statesmen, were puppets in his hands. As long as they served his purposes, they were given their places in the limelight. But with the solitary exception of Cranmer, one after another they were sacrificed to justify a change in policy. First there was Katherine of Aragon, that proud but hapless queen, whose fall occasioned the dismissal of the haughty Cardinal Wolsey. Wolsey was not the author of the English revolt from the Holy See but he paved the way by demonstrating as papal legate how it was possible to administer ecclesiastical affairs in England without reference to Rome.

Among Wolsey's employees was the clever and unscrupulous Thomas Cromwell, "who was the fitting instrument to carry through the social and religious changes made at the Reformation." Although only a layman, he rose to be Henry's vicegerent for the Church and by suppressing monasteries and abbeys made his master for a while fabulously wealthy. But when the last important abbey had been surrendered Cromwell's fate was sealed and his death was pitiful. The author truly observes that Cromwell's "dissolution of the monasteries was the momentous fact of Henry VIII's reign, more momentous even that the break with the papacy for that might have been patched up if it had not been for the suppression." Indeed, there was a distinctive financial flavor to the religious revolt in England.

Sadly we learn how the clergy abjectly submitted to Henry VIII. It was their duty to defend the Church from this tyrant. Only St. John Fisher, the Observants of Greenwich, the Carthusians, the Bridgetins of Syon, and a few others emulated the layman, St. Thomas More, in resolutely facing the issues. But the vacillating policy of Clement VII failed them and the shifting political maneuvers between Charles V and Francis I enabled Henry to consolidate his gains. For the most part the English people remained as Catholic in their daily lives as ever.

Cranmer is the man who made the English Church definitely Protestant. Whereas the author deals realistically with Henry VIII, Wolsey, Cromwell, and Anne Boleyn, he constantly tries to explain away and extenuate the inconsistencies in Cranmer. Cranmer's ability to write smooth and flowing English apparently blinds him to the reformer's obvious defects. The weakest part of this book is his effort to account for Cranmer's dog-like submission to the king in all religious matters while at heart he was holding Lutheran doctrines which Henry VIII execrated.

In the second part on the religious revolt the growth of Protestantism in the English universities of Oxford and Cambridge is traced. Many pages are devoted to the lives of Tyndale and Coverdale and to the English Bible over which Smith grows lyrical. In the chapters on the doctrine and the ceremonial in the Anglican Church a Catholic will challenge

several of the author's statements. Thus, it is not true to maintain that according to Catholic teaching "the Pope is alone the successor of the Apostles" (p. 374) as Smith will learn if he reads the decrees of the Council of Trent, Session XXXIII, Chapter IV. Nor is it surprising that Cranmer and Latimer misunderstood the Catholic position on purgatory (p. 444); but the conclusion which the author draws from the fourth article of the accusations against the martyr John Forest is altogether amazing. American Catholics will be not a little amused by his inference that the "Sancta Romana Ecclesia" is an Italian Church just as the Anglican Church is English.

But these are minor blemishes in a book which is continuously interesting and at the same time an impressive achievement of scholarship.

HARRY C. KOENIG

St. Mary of the Lake Seminary
Mundelein

Storia dell' introduzione del cristianesimo in Cina. [*Fonti Ricciane*]. Edite e commentate da PASQUALE M. D'ELIA, S.J. Volumes II-III. (Roma: La Libreria della Stato. 1949. Pp. xxxv, 652; xi, 372.)

The eminent sinologist, Pasquale d'Elia, S.J., continues in these two volumes the monumental task of editing the complete works of Matteo Ricci, S.J., the famous missionary and scholar who in the sixteenth century established the foundations of Christianity in the modern era in China and presided at the genesis of intercultural relations between the West and the Far East.

The first volume, reviewed in these columns in January, 1948 (XXXIII, 463-465), brought Ricci's own narrative down to the year 1597, covering the first fifteen years of his experience in China. The second volume, which has now appeared, brings Ricci's story to a close with his death and burial in 1610 in the imperial city of Peking. Chapter XXI, describing Ricci's death, was written in November, 1611, by Father Ferreira, one of the great pioneer's companions. The concluding chapter, on Ricci's burial, as well as several other chapters interpolated earlier, are from the pen of Father Nicholas Trigault who in 1615 brought Ricci's manuscript to Europe. The rest is the work of Ricci himself.

The third volume contains four appendices and the analytical index for the first three volumes. This index, divided into two sections, one of which deals with European words or romanizations, the other with Chinese characters, numbers over 300 pages. This alone indicates the truly massive proportions of the scholarship that has gone into the preparation of these volumes. Already d'Elia is at work on other volumes to follow, which are to contain Ricci's letters, his Chinese writings, and letters of

his Jesuit companions which throw light on his own work, the official annual reports of the Chinese mission of the time.

The two volumes here under review fully maintain the extraordinarily high level of scholarship attained in the first volume. As that earlier volume whetted the appetite for more of the same, so the second volume makes it extremely difficult to await in patience for the appearance of volume four which will contain Ricci's own correspondence.

Ricci's history of the introduction of Christianity into China and his letters were, of course, edited and published once before, by Father Tacchi-Venturi, S.J. in 1911. But there is no comparison between the earlier edition and that of d'Elia. Tacchi-Venturi rendered a great service in bringing to light for the first time Ricci's own manuscript; but Tacchi-Venturi was not a sinologist. D'Elia, on the other hand, is one of the most eminent sinologists alive today and he has devoted most of the last quarter of a century to the laborious research that has gone into the editing of these two volumes.

The copious notes that accompany the text make the reader the beneficiary of this research. From Chinese sources d'Elia identifies the numerous personalities whom Ricci mentions but who, in the earlier edition, remained scarcely more than mysterious and sometimes mystifying "romanizations." Not only has d'Elia identified these personalities, but he has been able to supply biographical details about them and thus to make them live. Not only do they come to life, but Ricci himself and the China which he so greatly enriched out of his truly profound learning and inexhaustible charity live again thanks to the erudition of Pasquale d'Elia.

Henceforth no one will dare to write of Matteo Ricci, or of Christian foundations in China, or of the Jesuit far eastern story, without recourse to these volumes.

GEORGE H. DUNNE

St. Francis Xavier Church
Phoenix, Arizona

Louis XIV contre Innocent XI. Les appels au futur concile de 1688 et l'opinion française. By JEAN ORCIBAL. (Paris: J. Vrin. 1949. Pp. 107.)

Jean Orcibal, who has become well known in recent years for his voluminous studies of the beginnings of Jansenism, presents in this short work a detailed investigation of the final phase in the long struggle between Louis XIV and Innocent XI. He has discovered much new information on the crisis of 1688 and some on that of 1717-1718.

After a first section in which the early relations of Louis and the Holy See are sketched, M. Orcibal shows that early in 1688 the king was ad-

vised by papal order that he and his ministers had incurred excommunication. It had been to avoid this extreme measure that Louis had labored to separate the French clergy from the Pope in 1682. Finding that Innocent XI was courageous enough to resist him, Louis, then at the summit of his power and the object of much adulation, determined to resist and toyed with the idea of a national council. He and his councillors were, however, afraid of public opinion which seemed to promise support for the Pope. A campaign of slander was launched against Innocent which recalls that of Philip the Fair against Boniface VIII. Innocent was accused of aiding Calvinism, of being the dupe of the Quietists and Jansenists, and of supporting William of Orange in his designs on England. The charge was circulated that Innocent would accept the leadership of Islam in order to ruin "the eldest son of the Church."

M. Orcibal studies this critical situation very carefully from the French viewpoint. One of the most interesting interventions was that of Fénelon which he summarises. In the author's opinion it was, however, the conquest of England by William of Orange which decided Louis to avoid extreme measures and to await the death of Innocent and the accession of a pope who would be more favorable to France. As his enemies multiplied the great king became more prudent. In a final section M. Orcibal studies the influence of the crisis of 1688 on that of 1717-1718.

EDWARD A. RYAN

Woodstock College

Apostolic Legations to China of the Eighteenth Century. By ANTONIO SISTO ROSSO, O.F.M. (South Pasadena: P. D. and Ione Perkins, 1948. Pp. 502. L. 550.)

This very interesting and informative book tells the history of the apostolic legations sent to China in the eighteenth century to settle problems of the missions there. As Father Rosso points out, the general story is already known, but the western accounts have failed to make full use of the eastern source materials, and have often been distorted by high feeling regarding the controversial rites question. In order to clarify the issue, he has prepared this volume as a synthesis of European and Chinese documentary material, treating the legations from a purely historical viewpoint as a contribution to Catholic mission history.

Realizing that the problems affecting the missions in China at that time were not merely of local origin, the author devotes his first section to their roots, discussing in considerable detail the rivalry of European powers in Asia and their differing religious policies, the growth and development of missionary organizations in the East, and especially the missionaries' attempts to accommodate themselves to the ancient civilizations of the

Orient, which in China led to the vexing rites controversy. This forms a solid foundation for the second section, which tells the story of the legations from 1705 to 1725, ending in a masterly summary (Chapter XI) that recapitulates the complex events of this period very clearly and concisely.

Part three contains translations of thirty-three Chinese official documents—many of them presented for the first time—from widely scattered collections. All are carefully annotated with comments on their authenticity, precise dating, etc., and helpful references to the personalities involved, especially if they have not figured in the previous sections. This portion is, in a sense, the most important contribution of the book; but for the average reader it will have less appeal, serving merely as evidence of the author's careful scholarship and as reference material for the statements in the previous section. The author himself admits that the documents are more important for their details than for the subjects they discuss; yet they still contain valuable source materials for future scholars and they are well presented for ease in consulting them with an excellent index.

By way of criticism, one notes some cases of apparent bias; e.g., in references to the K'ang-hsi emperor. This powerful and enlightened sovereign appears on these pages as a rather weak and spineless character, quite at variance with the usual characterizations of him. His broad tolerance was noteworthy—as shown again and again in the documents—but he was definitely not indecisive. It is interesting to observe, in his decrees presented here, repeated expressions of disgust at the national and factional bickerings among the Christian teachers in China which were so much at variance with the doctrine taught him in his childhood by his European tutors.

Then, too, the handling of the proper names is often quite exasperating, all having been kept in their original form. Thus we find "Kung Chiu" for Confucius, "Infante Henrique" for Prince Henry the Navigator, "Kuang Chou" for Canton, etc., forcing the average American reader to stop and think before he recognizes familiar people and places behind the strange-sounding names. Since the author was presenting his material in English, it would seem to have been preferable to use the accredited English usages whenever possible. One also finds a number of misprints. However, these are all comparatively small points and do not greatly detract from this fine work of very meticulous scholarship.

SCHUYLER V. R. CAMMANN

University of Pennsylvania

Gregorio XVI. Miscellanea Commemorativa. Two Volumes. (Roma: A Cura dei Padri Camaldolesi di S. Gregorio al Celio. 1948. Pp. xxii, 456; 560. L. 10,000.)

These two volumes on the pontificate of Gregory XVI (1831-1846) will doubtless fill a long felt need. Originally they were planned to appear on the centenary of the death of Gregory, June 1, 1946. Numerous difficulties prevented Dom Anselmo Giabbani, under whose able direction the miscellany was finally assembled, from meeting this deadline. Monsignor Giuseppe de Luca's preface points out the well known fact that Gregory has suffered from a kind of *legenda negra* as the classic embodiment of papal reaction in an epoch of *Ottocento* anti-papalism and revolutionary liberalism. This, perhaps, more than anything else explains the fact that Gregory has had no Artaud de Montor as had his predecessors. The sketches of Sylvain, Montani, Wiseman, and Wagner, and even Schmidlin's study, no more than outline the rich pontificate of Gregory XVI. This miscellany is no biography, nor is it a history, but neither will be written without much use being made of its two volumes. The usefulness of the miscellany might be enhanced, however, if some formal biographical sketch of the Pontiff had been attempted. The essay which comes closest to filling this need is, "Gregorio XVI, papa umanista."

A miscellany inevitably suffers from the defects of its virtues. No less than twenty-six different authors write as many representative essays in five different languages on the astonishingly varied activity of Gregory XVI, but unity and continuity are lost with diversity. The articles of the first volume treat of Gregory's religious and cultural activity; the second of his ecclesiastical, political, and diplomatic activity. That Gregory was a great humanist in the best papal traditions of that word finds abundant proof in the detailed accounts of the Pope's interest and patronage of the art and culture which historically has its focus in Rome. He was as interested in Etruscan as in Christian archaeology; the foundation of the Etruscan, the Egyptian, and the Lateran museums attest to this fact. He left Rome a more beautiful and modern city than he found it. He also left the spiritual leadership of the Papacy greater than he had found it and in many ways anticipated the *Syllabus of Errors* with his condemnation of Lamennais and Hermes and of ecclesiastical liberalism in general.

Historians will find the material of the second volume most useful. Revolution and the *Risorgimento* marked the beginning and the end of his pontificate. In fact, the revolution of 1848 had its first beginnings, not in France but in Italy, and in the Italy of Gregory rather than of Pio Nono. Gregory was an anti-revolutionary rather than an anti-liberal. The intervention of France, Austria, Prussia, Russia, and England, through their famous memorandum of 1831, recommending reforms in the internal administration of the Papal States, is the subject of two articles which give the heretofore undocumented Vatican side of the issue. The exhaustive account of the conversations between Czar Nicholas I and Gregory XVI on the rights of Catholics in Russia and Grisar's similarly full account of

the Pope's dealings with the Prussian government will go far toward burying the legend that Gregory was a "mediocre" Pope. Father Leturia's essay on the policy of Gregory toward Spanish America shows better than any other article that the Pontiff was not the absolute reactionary he is often painted but an unusually sympathetic and understanding friend of the republics. His *Sollicitudo ecclesiarum* expressed a policy as Pope which he had adopted as a cardinal in 1825 when first commissioned to study the problem of appointing bishops in the new republics without benefit of Spanish patronage. The Papacy would deal with governments established *de facto*, without thereby going into questions of abstract rights. The spiritual independence of the Church would thus be saved, without which her mission could not be accomplished, the theme incidentally of Gregory's first apologetic work. The essay on Gregory XVI and England further clarifies the Pope's true position on political liberalism. Gregory's relations with the Church in the United States are briefly treated with interesting documents added from the archives of the Propaganda. Under Gregory, too, began a needed missionary renaissance, as Archbishop Costantini's article ably illustrates.

The bibliographies of most of the essays are limited, but a rather complete bibliography on Gregory XVI is given by Paolo dalla Torre at the end of his article, "L'opera riformatrice ed amministrativa di Gregorio XVI." He is co-editor of the entire work. The miscellany has a number of contemporary illustrations. While these volumes bring forth some new documents their chief value lies in furnishing in a convenient form material on modern papal history not otherwise easily accessible.

WILLIAM J. COLEMAN

Maryknoll Junior College

AMERICAN CHURCH HISTORY

Le Secret de Junípero Serra. Fondateur de la Californie-Nouvelle, 1769-1784. By CHARLES J. G. MAXIMIN PIETTE, O.F.M. Two Volumes. (Washington, D. C.: Academy of American Franciscan History. 1949. Pp. 480; 595. $6.00 for the set.)

Most timely are these two volumes written about a great Spaniard and a great westerner because this man of deep soul, born on the Isle of Majorca and later become a Franciscan, is being considered as worthy of elevation to the highest honors which the Church can confer, formally recognized sainthood. Whether these volumes were prepared to promote so estimable a cause this reviewer does not know. But he does know that apart from any intention of the author this biography delineates a saint. Undistracted and undeterred devotion to the cause of God, a phase of

which we call zeal for the salvation of souls; unerring uprightness of character and disposition in the midst of external enmities, difficulties, and oppositions; an internal serenity and heroism sprung from the union of his spirit with God—these are what constitute the saint and these are the qualities which Fray Junípero Serra possessed. Fame he did not seek (no saint ever does) but, of course, his great human qualities together with the energetic pursuance of his goal made of him a great historical figure of the West, admired of all creeds, and brought him greater fame than has been the lot of any other westerner to possess. So it always is with saints: what they do not seek comes to them because of their sheer and undiluted excellence.

A great American historian has often said that Junípero Serra was fortunate in having possessed a biographer of the qualities of his Franciscan confrère Francisco Palóu. This was, indeed, part of his fortune so far as the ephemeral human relationship is concerned. But we venture the statement that Serra would never have had his Palóu but for the former's peerless qualities of soul. These drew like a magnet the admiration and affection of the biographer who himself needed a measure of greatness to appreciate them. And that he possessed the energy and enterprise to sit down and write out the career of the great man we can be eternally grateful.

A century and a half after the death of Serra (1784) another confrère appeared, Charles Maximin Piette, who rounded out and completed before his death what Palóu bequeathed to posterity. Father Piette was able to do this because he put into his possession the written word of Serra which is again the reflection of the greatness of his soul. Palóu saw the deeds and witnessed the virtues of the great man; Piette, drawing upon hundreds of letters gathered in from a dozen archives, was able to feel the warmth which breathes from these documents and with art he was able to pass it on to the reading public of a secularist mid-twentieth century. Great credit is due, therefore, to the present author, for he had to sense the moral beauty of his hero and to present it with artistic design. Moreover, his energy was admirable. For almost a decade of years Father Piette travelled over two continents seeking out those precious nuggets wherein lay the value of Serra's soul. The author was the collector and interpreter par excellence of the letters of Serra. In the archives of the California missions from San Francisco north to San Diego south; in Mexico, in Texas, in Washington, in Spain the searcher looked for, found, and lifted from dusty bundles those letters which remake and refurbish the character of the man. This precious material in addition to Palóu's *Vida* and Serra's own *Diario,* together with a hundred letters of other Franciscans, of viceroys, of governors, of soldiers—these lift the present volumes into the class of an invaluable human contribution to the rich inheritance

of our western civilization. And, therefore, the present reviewer opines that with Palóu, Piette has become Serra's peerless biographer and because of its singular excellence this work will live for decades and, perhaps, forever as the classical contribution to an enthralling theme. Like Palóu two centuries ago Piette became fixed in admiration of the beauty of that soul and it was one of Serra's letters to the viceroy pleading in favor of Fages who had treated him like a school boy which set the purpose of Father Piette to compose this biography.

The reader sees portrayed periods of Serra's life and activities which have been hitherto less known, for instance, the boyhood and youth in the Island of Majorca, the little known but ardent and heroic missionary activity in central Mexico from 1749 to 1767, the brief interlude of Baja California, and then the famous expeditions north into the fair hills and valleys of what became the Golden State. Concerning the Lower California episode the author deserves praise for his candid objectivity. There was born, because of the selfishness of one group, a division in the midst of the Franciscan family concerning Baja California. They did not know its hard rocks, its parched soil, and its craggy, forbidding sierra. The Jaliscan friars, therefore, wanted these former Jesuit missions and took measures with the viceroy to get them. The friars of the College of San Fernando, to whom the rocky peninsula had been first assigned, instituted counter-measures to get them back and they did. This incident, just mentioned by Palóu in his *New California,* is brought out by the present author with interesting detail. Also praiseworthy is the fine and sympathetic delineation of character which we find in the major portion of these volumes dedicated to Serra's founding of the Alta California missions. Serra attracted the friendship of great men; small men could not appreciate him. The able and enegetic José de Gálvez, *Vivitador General* of King Carlos III, admired Serra. The character of this official, to whom more than to anyone else we owe the initiation of the great project, is well brought out in these pages. Father Piette's predecessor, Zephrin Engelhardt, could not appeciate Gálvez because he saw only the latter's enmity towards the Jesuits. There is a splendid character portrayal of Alta California's second governor, Fernando de Rivera y Moncada, who was called upon to suffer the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune. Piette's humane and intelligent portrayal of this man, who was a thorn in Serra's side, is done with the strokes of one who deeply understood the convolutions of human nature. The small and impudent dictator, Don Pedro Fages, is cleverly drawn, while the magnificent Fray Francisco Palóu moves through these pages in strong and constructive tread. Concerning the hero himself, certain intepretations could not be more finely done. As all through the volumes Serra's letters are allowed to speak, so at his death these documents, commingled with the

author's reflections, create a picture of dramatic beauty. Serra died thinking all his work a frustration. Only nine missions had been founded; there were the intractability of officials and the dearth of missionaries; Serra's friends at the viceregal court had gone; Viceroy Bucareli was no more; final and fatal blow to the man's suffering spirit, the Franciscans in Alta California were to be replaced by Dominicans. In this persuasion Serra breathed his last in 1784. The supernatural strength within him sustained a serenity of spirit. What God allowed he would quietly accept. He went to sleep upon his wooden pallet at Carmel after brave and strong singing in the church and in the midst of his communings with God. It was the dramatic end of a strong and colorful career.

There is critical historic value in these volumes. The sources speak from the pages, documents give the evidence, even though these tend to slow down and to clog the exquisite and running style of the author. Points which some historians suspected were over-drawn or invented by Palóu here receive certification from complementary documents. For instance, Palóu gives four different accounts of the circumstances of Serra's death and in these there is no variation of factual presentation. The incident of the appearance of the *San Antonio,* fat with provisions for the sick and starving colony at San Diego, just at the end of the novena of prayers organized by Serra, is narrated not only by Palóu in his *Vida,* but by the Spanish official, Matías Armona, and in several letters of Serra himself. The incident is factual and Portolá, wisely deciding on departure, was now enabled to stay. The colony, the mission, and the whole of Alta California were saved for Spain.

Some errors or inexactitudes were naturally to be expected. There is some confusion concerning the number of former Jesuit missions in Baja California. They were as a matter of fact only thirteen at this period and the map at the beginning of Volume II sadly misplaces them. José de Gálvez organized not four, but five expeditions for the colonization of Alta California. The ship *San José* loaded with much precious ware needful for San Diego went out to sea never to return. I venture to differ with the judgment of Father Piette concerning footnotes. We want to know while reading so delectable a biography where the sustaining and quoted letters and documents are to be found, but the author refers us only to his former work, *Lettres de Junípero Serra.* The narrative is enriched with pious and philosophical reflections and there are some who will object to this in a work of scientific import, but not this reviewer, for they are humanely and elegantly done. It is unfortunate an index was not furnished: the volumes call loudly for one.

It is permissable, I think, to regret that this work did not first appear in English dress with all the elegance which Father Piette has given to it in French and with its picture of mission beginnings in Alta California

more intimate than has ever been drawn before. We hope that the forthcoming promised translation will not lose any of the warm and enriching qualities which the author has given to the original French.

PETER MASTEN DUNNE

University of San Francisco

Religion and Education under the Constitution. By J. M. O'NEILL. (New York: Harper & Bros. 1949. Pp. xii, 338. $4.00.)

This is a book about the first amendment and specifically about the meaning of the phrase, "establishment of religion." "My thesis," writes Professor O'Neill, "is that the words, 'an establishment of religion,' meant to Madison, Jefferson, the members of the First Congress, the historians, the legal scholars, and substantially all Americans who were at all familiar with the Constitution until very recent years, *a formal legal union of a single church or religion with government, giving the one church or religion an exclusive position of power and favor over all other churches or denominations.*" (author's italics.)

In support of this thesis the author has assembled about 150 well-documented pages of historical evidence. "No single official church in the federal government" was what the states which petitioned the first amendment wanted; Madison and Jefferson had the same idea; against the background of the times the language could have no other meaning; by seeking a new amendment to outlaw tax aid to religious institutions several United States Congresses have implicitly acknowledged that the first amendment deals with "establishment" in a precise and restricted sense. This thesis and its supporting evidence were reviewed by the Supreme Court in the McCollum decision. Said Mr. Justice Black, speaking for the majority: "They (i.e., counsel for the Champaign school board) argue that historically the First Amendment was intended to forbid only government preference of one religion over another, not an impartial governmental assistance of all religions. . . . After giving full consideration to the arguments presented, we are unable to accept . . ." this contention.

The big difference between these two interpretations of the first amendment is that Professor O'Neill gives historical reasons for his view while the Supreme Court rests its case on the premise that "religion and government can best work to achieve their lofty aims if each is left free from the other within its respective sphere." Mr. O'Neill wants the court to stick to the letter of the law, but the court prefers to find the law's full meaning, or the so-called "spirit of the law" in "the relevant history of religious education in America, the place of the 'released time' movement in that history . . ." because after all, said Mr. Justice Frankfurter, "the meaning of a spacious conception like that of the separation of Church

from State is unfolded as appeal is made to the principle from case to case."

Professor O'Neill spares few invectives in his denunciation of the court's virtual contempt for historical evidence and its predilection for legal positivism. We are warned that more decisions like the McCollum verdict may put us "under the unrestrained dictatorship of the men on the Supreme bench" even though the court "is not yet in the position of the Russian Politburo." Wild statements like these detract considerably from the general excellence of the book which, were it a little more objectively and dispassionately written, might have no small influence in persuading Supreme Court researchers to re-examine some of the very dubious history set forth in the Everson and McCollum decisions. Unfortunately, the book probably will be classified as a polemic, not as a volume of historical research.

This reviewer hopes that Professor O'Neill will write another book on the same topic, and that it will be more carefully written and better balanced than his first major venture in the complicated fields of jurisprudence and political science. This is no idle wish, for in my opinion, the author's long association with the American Civil Liberties Union eminently qualifies him to defend, with every argument he can command, the right of parents to control the education of their children and to have this education include, if they so desire, religious instruction. Perhaps, in this new volume he could prove that his interpretation of the first amendment is not only true historically, but that it is also perfectly valid and satisfactory for present-day relationships of Church and State in our nation. Taking the Supreme Court on its own premises of "progressive law," he might be able to show that American democracy will be best served today by a government which impartially aids all religions but shows preference for none.

WILLIAM E. MCMANUS

National Catholic Welfare Conference

The History of the Sisters of Providence of Saint Mary-of-the-Woods, Volume I. By SISTER MARY BORROMEO BROWN. (New York: Benziger Bros. 1949. Pp. xiii, 826. $6.00.)

Sister Mary Borromeo has written a history worthy of the great congregation of which she is a member. Each of its more than 800 pages gives evidence of scholarly research and careful recording; the content is satisfying; the bibliography complete, the index excellent. The volume under review carries the history of the congregation in Indiana through its first sixteen years. The opening chapters give a resumé of the foundation in 1806 of the Sisters of Providence at Ruillé-sur-Loir, France. In

1840 this community sent its first contingent of sisters under the able leadership of Mother Theodore Guérin across the Atlantic in answer to the appeal of the second Bishop of Vincennes, Celestine de la Hailandière. The first years in Indiana held much suffering; only a woman of Mother Theodore's capability and courage could have kept the new establishment from foundering. In God's time, however, peace and prosperity rewarded the hard beginnings.

Undoubtedly some reviewers will consider that the inclusion of long letters, as well as some of the descriptive and historical facts about Indiana, retard unnecessarily the forward movement of the narrative. This reviewer is not of that opinion, and for two reasons. First, the historian of a religious body writes for two audiences: her own community and the general public. At no time does she, nor should she, lose sight of the first audience—the present and future members of her congregation. Complete letters and details, not of special interest to the outsider, may be of vital import to those on the inside, and particularly when, for reasons of prudence and charity, silence has prevailed on early domestic and ecclesiastical difficulties. Secondly, a rich historical background of the area where the foundation was made is essential for the complete record since religious congregations neither originate nor develop in a vacuum.

The story of the struggle to found this congregation in the wilderness makes amply evident the price religious women have paid during the past century to establish Catholic education in our Republic. The continuation of the history of Saint Mary-of-the-Woods will be a record of splendid success in a great cause. Readers of Volume I and all students of American Church history will anticipate with pleasure its publication.

SISTER M. ROSALITA KELLY

Marygrove College

The Catholic University of America, 1887-1896. The Rectorship of John J. Keane. By PATRICK H. AHERN. (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1948. Pp. xi, 220. $3.00.)

The Catholic University of America, 1896-1903. The Rectorship of Thomas J. Conaty. By PETER E. HOGAN, S.S.J. (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1949. Pp. xi, 212. $3.00.)

These two books recall the far-off days when the campus of the Catholic University of America housed only Caldwell Hall, the affiliated Paulist house of studies, the old Yorkshire Farmer Crook's cottage, and the engine room of the artesian well. From the menacing clouds that hung over the cradle of the American hierarchy's great educational institution came storm after storm. Cardinal Gibbons spoke sorrowfully to the Cardinal Secretary of State of the unrelenting attacks; Bishop Spalding

openly pronounced the University a failure; the Holy See suddenly removed the whole-souled, hard working first rector; and his puzzled successor was entangled in endless misunderstandings and conflicts. But the books before us—items in a steadily growing series of exhibits—give evidence that, whatever its mishaps and mistakes, the University has made and is now making important contributions to the intellectual growth of the Church in this country.

Both books are written against the background of *The Formative Years* by John Tracy Ellis; both are strictly factual, almost like the reports of a military campaign; each of the two could easily be expanded into a much larger volume. Well filled with the results of diligent spade work done by the two authors, they describe frankly and lucidly the complicated early history of the University, quite in the spirit which Leo XIII said should characterize a Catholic historian. Although prepared in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the master of arts degree, they would qualify as doctorate theses in many a university.

The story of Keane's rectorship is inevitably the more interesting, not only because of his more impressive personality, but also because he touched life at so many points, both in this country and abroad, during an era momentous for the United States and for the world. If we were to choose for mention one out of many illuminating features of the tale, it might well be the amazing and nearly unknown story of Satolli's almost successful attempt to take the School of Law and the School of Medicine away from Georgetown and transfer them to the Catholic University of America over Keane's head and despite his opposition.

As Father Ahern, the competent and well prepared historian of Keane's rectorship, is writing a complete biography of that great man, he may welcome an indication of several points that deserve to be featured in the projected work: Keane's relationship with McGlynn which affected Archbishop Corrigan's sentiment toward the first rector; the bold part Keane played in dealing with Cardinal Rampolla during his residence in Rome (on which Soderini throws light in his still unpublished manuscript on Americanism); Shahan's well beloved University *Bulletin;* the profound and almost forgotten influence on students and professors and the country at large of Keane's protégé, Pace.

Conaty's rectorship provides a comparatively thin story, but Father Hogan elaborates and illustrates it so richly that, all in all, his volume may, perhaps, appeal to an even wider circle of readers than its companion. He presents vastly interesting documents on the Schroeder case; he publishes Grannan's devastating attacks upon the second rector, which so unquestionably breathe "a biased spirit;" he adds a chapter on personalities; he introduces a thirty-five page summary of the story of Americanism which might, perhaps, have helpfully appeared earlier in

the book, but in any event is of no little value as it stands. The author does not give much attention to Conaty's inauguration and to Gibbons' speech on that occasion—an omission due possibly to the fact that in that year and the following, the academic *Chronicle* was separated from the *Bulletin* and thus became almost extinct. By a curious departure from customary routine, the letter of resignation sent by the incomparable Périès to the Board of Trustees is quoted here from an English newspaper and not from the minutes of the board. This may be connected with the fact that a certified copy of those same minutes was sent to Klein "through the kindness of Archbishop Ireland" and printed in Klein's volume, *L'Américanisme* (Paris, 1949).

Of both volumes it can be said that they are attractive in appearance; that each is provided with a good index and a good bibliography, and that the proof-reader of each has been rather casual about French orthography.

JOSEPH MCSORLEY

Church of St. Paul the Apostle
New York City

GENERAL HISTORY

Meaning in History. The Theological Implications of the Philosophy of History. By KARL LÖWITH. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1949. Pp. ix, 257. $4.00.)

The sub-title of this work states precisely the point of view from which the author approaches the problem of meaning in history. He contends that "philosophy of history," which he defines as "a systematic interpretation of universal history in accordance with a principle by which historical events and successions are unified and directed towards an ultimate meaning," is entirely dependent upon theology of history, in particular in the theological concept of history as the history of fulfilment and salvation. Since Voltaire invented the term "philsophy of history" and first used it in a sense distinct from the theological interpretation of history, an all too common opinion has held that proper historical thinking begins only with modern times, in the eighteenth century, and that the theological interpretation of history—or approximately 1400 years of western thought from St. Augustine to Bossuet—is negligible. It is the thesis of Dr. Löwith that philosophy of history begins with the Hebrew and Christian faith in a fulfilment and that it ends with the secularization of its eschatological pattern. (The classical world-view of endlessly recurring cycles is no true philosophy of history at all). Because of the religious foundation of the Christian Occident, he maintains, the western historical consciousness is determined by an eschatological motivation, from Isaias to Marx, from St. Augustine to Hegel, and from Joachim of Flora to Schell-

ing. Christian in derivation but anti-Christian in consequence, modern interpretations of history with their broad assumption of progress have secularized a theological pattern. They have transformed the original faith in salvation and judgment into the modern belief in ever increasing improvements by which history is supposed to redeem itself.

To demonstrate his thesis, Dr. Löwith adopts the novel device of an inverted sequence, beginning with the philosophies of history of the nineteenth and eighteenth centuries (Burckhardt, Marx, Hegel, Proudhon, Comte, Condorcet, Turgot, Voltaire), as more accessible to the modern mind, and working back through the theologies of history (Vico, Bossuet, Joachim, Orosius, St. Augustine) to arrive at the biblical view of history, the ultimate source of western historical thought. The regressive method is well suited to an analytical reduction of the modern compound into its original elements. The author attempts no detailed account of the dozen or so writers under consideration. He is interested only in that part of their thought which presents, or relates to, an interpretation of history. In the case of each he outlines the writer's thought, evaluates and criticizes it, and locates it in the general sequence which is being developed. A certain inequality of treatment is inevitable. Readers will react variously according to their individual tastes. The section on Vico is one of the best.

The introduction and, more especially, the conclusion present Dr. Löwith's own reflections on a Christian interpretation of history. They are as vital as they are profound and many will regard them, perhaps, as the most stimulating parts of the book. From a non-Catholic, they are a welcome antidote to liberal Protestant views of progressive evolution.

GEORGE B. FLAHIFF

Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies
Toronto

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Michelangelo: The Medici Chapel. By CHARLES DE TOLNAY (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1948. Pp. xiii, 275. 330 Plates. $20.00.)

The third volume of this exceptional work is comparable to its two predecessors in scholarship and insight; comparable to the second in the magnificence of its subject matter. This volume is not confined by its subtitle, "The Medici Chapel," any more than was its predecessor. It covers all the works of the period 1520-1534, a phase of Michelangelo's artistic development during which the Medici chapel was his chief production.

The reader of the other volumes will expect a remarkable combination of excellences in this work, and will not be disappointed. There is a base of careful biographical and historical learning. There is a patient, sometimes almost arithmetical description of details in architecture or in sculp-

ture. But these minutiae are never pedantic, for they are mingled with rich comparative suggestion from the author's memory which is a sort of museum of visual experience. Above all there is always present a broad comprehension of the artist's purpose, based partly on the critic's insight, partly on a careful study of the documentation in Michelangelo's poetry, letters, sketches, etc. An admirable example of this combination of qualities is to be found in the tenth and eleventh chapters. Here de Tolnay summarizes the history of interpretation of the chapel, reviewing briefly the Renaissance idea of the glorification of historic persons, the idea of Condivi and others of a stern *memento mori,* the nineteenth-century distortion to its own political or subjectivist moods. Dismissing these theories he sets forth at some length his own view that it was the artist's purpose in this monument to carry the beholder "away from empirical reality" into another world where he might find in stone the visual expression of that synthesis of Platonic and Christian thoughts which was Michelangelo's belief concerning the life after death. To read the pages in which de Tolnay sets this down is to have an experience in really great criticism. It is a most unusual blending of specialized and technical considerations with high imaginative, poetical, and theological *aperçus.*

> The plain, severe Medici Chapel, on the other hand, carries the beholder out of this world into the realm of departed souls, and summons him to serious meditation on death and the immortality of the soul. The thought of transience and of eternal life becomes here the real substratum of the modeling. The impression that this world of departed souls is the true reality is produced in the beholder above all by the supernatural dimensions of the statues and by the placing of these statues above the level of the beholder's head. They consequently dominate and subdue him, making him feel that he himself belongs to an unreal realm of shadows.
>
> In summary, the Medici Chapel is not an ordinary building destined merely to contain tombs, but a unit, expressing a definite idea-content. It is an abbreviated image of the universe (p. 74).

The illustrations are magnificent and in generous number. To consult them as one reads the text is to have again something of the feeling of that first day in Florence when you came through the unimpressive doorway into that strange world of white and grey and felt the chill of having moved beyond the "flammantia moenia mundi."

Anyone who in this day of ours continues to cherish the values which these volumes represent must be grateful to the Princeton University Press, to the American Council of Learned Societies, and to the Carnegie Corporation for carrying on this costly undertaking. An article in the *Times Literary Supplement* concerning another American work stated wistfully that it recalled to English lovers of noble books a time that had passed for their country and that might never come again. We are happy

that our own country can and will give of its substance for the production of books like this and we hope that the welcome from the public will be such as to encourage the tradition of munificence.

JOHN K. CARTWRIGHT

St. Matthew's Cathedral
Washington

South Africa under King Sebastian and the Cardinal, 1557-1580. By SYDNEY R. WELCH. (Capetown and Johannesburg: Juta and Co., Ltd. 1949. Pp. 487. 30/.)

This study is the third in a series by Dr. Welch dealing with the early Portuguese occupation of South Africa. In the first two, *South Africa under King Manuel, 1495-1521* (Capetown, 1946) and *South Africa under King John III, 1521-1557* (Capetown, 1949), the author was principally concerned with the political factors governing the earliest Portuguese expansion along the African coast, with the vicissitudes of exploration and early settlement, and with the fluctuating fate of colonial policy makers in Portugal. In this third study he has placed greater emphasis on actual colonial practice of the Portuguese: the financial reforms inaugurated under Sebastian, the relations with Kafirs, Arabs, and Bantas, and the place and function of the Church, missionary activity, and the Inquisition. As a result this volume is a considerable improvement over the two preceding studies, since its presentation of the main trends in Portuguese policy is supplemented by a picture of the developments in Africa itself. Too much material in the preceding studies seemed ephemeral if not ethereal; Portuguese policy appeared to exist in a vacuum, unrelated to colonial developments. Not the least of the merits of the present study is its successful attempt to portray Portuguese expansion in its world setting, and the chapters on the first Dutch and English colonization attempts are among the best in the whole book.

In two respects only does this study seem to fall short of its mark. The first is concerned with the relative scanty treatment of colonial economy. Nowhere in the book are we provided with much of an insight into the delicate economic structure of the Portuguese colonial empire. The chapter dealing with "Cape Cargoes and the New Finance" at best illustrates the economic interdependence of colonial powers on the world market and the financial astuteness of King Sebastian. But the Portuguese empire was a commercial empire, and to understand it fully a discussion of the machinery of colonial economy seems indispensable. Profits, losses, types of produce and production, land tenure, labor supply, the character of investment and the extent of royal supervision—these are but a few of the aspects which should have been dealt with more fully.

Secondly, and as a result of this omission, the causes of the decline of the Portuguese colonial empire are by no means clear. This decline was primarily due to a stagnation of economic resources, the cost of rigid royal monopoly over the trade with the colonies. But Dr. Welch's treatment of comparative Spanish and Portuguese policy seems to indicate that the decline was due to Spanish encroachment upon dynastic integrity in Portugal itself, leading to the conquest of Portugal by Phillip II. This impression, that the government changed hands but that the economic structure remained unaffected, is open to serious question. Portugal's role as a colonial power of major importance was over long before the Spanish conquest. Alva's armies merely completed what his royal master himself had long since suspected.

JUSTUS M. VAN DER KROEF

Michigan State College

Francis the Good. The Education of an Emperor, 1768-1792. By WALTER CONSUELO LANGSAM. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1949. Pp. ix, 205. $3.50.)

Born in 1768, Francis had three strong-willed, energetic relatives: a grandmother, an uncle, and a father, all interested in the education of the future heir to the Habsburg possessions and all convinced that a sovereign must tirelessly serve the state. In consequence the education of Francis was closely supervised. His grandmother, Maria Theresa, chose the Countess von Starhemberg to watch over the prince for his first years and also made the selection of his chief tutor, Count Francis de Paula Charles von Colloredo-Waldsee, who began his work in 1774 and remained with Francis even after his accession to the throne. From 1774 to 1784 Francis' education was mainly directed by his father, Grand Duke Leopold; then Joseph II decided that the training in Florence was not suitable for a future emperor. Francis went to Vienna where he remained under his uncle's observing, critical eyes. The young prince realized the affection that accompanied the emperor's pointing out of faults, but Francis was naturally depressed by the severity of the comments. How many persons of sixteen years and a half could have cheerfully read a description of themselves that contained such unvarnished words as "molly-coddle," "the weakling, without ability, accustomed to being led," who was unaware of "the simplest universal feelings" and who showed an "immeasurable love of self, indolence, indifference, and indecision?" How many could have heard such a description of themselves read and reread as Francis did? Joseph II's high standards demanded constant studying and activity by the boy. The royal road to learning was not an easy one. Finally the knowledge possessed by Francis was wide and varied and the

earlier trait of pride had been restrained so that he was humble and modest when he became emperor.

Very little has been written about Francis. Joseph II, Napoleon, and Metternich have dominated the center of the canvases that would show Francis in the three phases of his life: his youth, his wars, and his last twenty years. Professor Langsam's main purpose has been to describe the education of Francis and he has done that well in the first two chapters which comprise two-thirds of the book. He has used many archival sources, such as Leopold's ideas about his son's education in 1774, 1779, and 1782; Colloredo's report to Joseph II in 1781 and to Leopold in 1783; Joseph's criticisms of 1784 and 1785; Colloredo's and Francis' journals. An ability to recapture the past is shown in the author's effective phrases and descriptions.

After "many years of study" Professor Langsam became convinced that the usual picture of Francis was incorrect. The last two chapters are chiefly a background for the modification which the author makes and a statement of the thesis for a revaluation of the reign of Francis, 1792-1835. In spite of inheriting a reactionary realm and having a long period of wars, Francis succeeded in improving "every phase of Austrian life" except that of politics. His own people called him "Francis the Good."

MARY LUCILLE SHAY

University of Illinois

AMERICAN HISTORY

Westward Expansion. A History of the American Frontier. By RAY ALLEN BILLINGTON with the collaboration of JAMES B. HEDGES. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1949. Pp. xiii, 873. $6.25; trade edition, $8.50.)

Basically a textbook, this history of the American frontier will naturally be compared with preceding treatments in textbook form by Paxson, Riegel, Clark, and others. Professor Billington's book will not suffer by such comparison. It differs from the others just mentioned in that it seems to contain more of a well placed emphasis upon the human element in history. Human beings rather than blind economic forces are considered responsible for the activities, good and bad, associated with the settlement of the West.

The story starts, as it should, with the colonial frontier; the year, 1492. Section two deals with the trans-Appalachian frontier; section three, comprising about half the book, is devoted to the trans-Mississippi frontier. One very interesting chapter, "The West in the American Revolution," analyzes the contributions made by George Rogers Clark. In the second section there is a very honestly presented account of the methods used

to force the Cherokee Indians out of Georgia. The parts played respectively not only by the Indians but also by the War Department, the Supreme Court, and Jackson are clearly sketched, with little honor to any of the participants save the Indians, and possibly the rather helpless Supreme Court. It is a sordid chapter, but that is not the fault of the author but rather of the Americans who felt no moral restraints when dealing with "uncivilized" Indians.

Most readers will learn much from the chapter, "The Shifting Sectional Pattern," because it contains a rather detailed account of the dishonesty practiced by various western states in the 1840's when state bond payments became irksome. Many English investors also learned something about American promises to pay, but their knowledge cost them about $100,000,000, the total of American state obligations that were simply repudiated. Chapter XXXI, "The Spanish Barrier," has in it an account of the contributions made by the Jesuit and Franciscan missionaries of the Southwest. A good understanding of missionary objectives is shown, and that cannot be said of many textbooks dealing with the subject. Much informative material on the missions in the Northwest is likewise found in the chapter, "The Occupation of Oregon."

One of the most extensive bibliographies available on the West and its problems increases the value of this excellent volume. For good measure a detailed and decidedly helpful index is added. This book deserves a place in your library.

PAUL KINIERY

Loyola University
Chicago

Characteristically American. By RALPH BARTON PERRY. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 1949. Pp. x, 162, v. $3.00.)

This volume comprises five lectures given by the author at the University of Michigan in 1948. He presents very readable, thoughtful, and thought-provoking reflections. National characteristics are frequently the subject of much prejudiced thinking. The familiar "Negoes are . . . ." "Germans are . . . ." etc., a prejudice that becomes the more vicious when placed on a permanent biological basis. Mr. Perry's more profound treatment is a refreshing antidote to such superficiality.

In popular usage "American" often stands for America's good qualities or the ideal; bad qualities are "un-American." The history of the United States has much to approve this usage if taken in the sense in which Mr. Perry apparently approves it, joined, i.e., with a frank avowal of American faults: ". . . . for James Americanism was a mixture of good and bad, in which for him the good prevailed and the bad was curable . . . .

he admired the ideal America." At the same time the writer uses "America" for too many particulars with a resulting number of paradoxes, and the predication as "American" of qualities found with equal frequency elsewhere or that are true only of certain Americans. In fact, the basic criticism of his book is on this point. As Mr. Perry admits, *Characteristically American* could better be entitled "My America." The book is a plea for pragmatic liberalism with William James getting one of the five chapters.

While the question of the relation between Catholicism and freedom is worthy of consideration, the problem for the forseeable future is a theoretic one and does not deserve the space given it by the author. More concern should have been shown about secular statism—just now communism—where freedom and American values have actually been destroyed and are being threatened on a world-wide plane. Although the writer condemns totalitarianism and stresses the importance of America's religious heritage and the thought of the Declaration of Independence, he does not follow this out in individual statements and in his conclusions. One hardly expected to see the old fiction of Russian "social" versus American "political" democracy revived in 1949!

The author's pragmatic liberalism apparently obscures his appreciation of the importance of certitude and unchanging values. He exaggerates when he says, "Americanism implies that saving doubt—that 'perhaps'—which softens the inquisitorial temper." Certainly Mr. Perry himself along with other good Americans would condemn communism, racism, rape, etc., without any "perhaps."

ANTHONY H. DEYE

Villa Madonna College
Covington

This Was America. Edited by OSCAR HANDLIN. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1949. Pp. ix, 602. $6.00.)

In something of the tone of a clarion call Archibald MacLeish recently summoned the readers of the *Atlantic Monthly* (August, 1949), to an "affirmative recommitment to . . . the vital and creative impulse of our national life." Just prior to his journey to Harvard to serve as Boylston professor, the former Assistant Secretary of State defined the soul of a nation as that "image it cherished of itself; the aspect in which it sees itself against the past; the attributes to which its future conduct must respond." Those readers who wish to make a more careful examination of this image, these attributes, will take pleasure from the volume of an-

other Harvard professor, Oscar Handlin's *This Was America.* Presenting "an orderly and connected picture of the people of the American past" as seen through the eyes of European travelers is no new device. No one denies that "America was both a challenge and a threat to the Old World," or that Europe's visions of America offer valuable clues to the temper and mind of that old world. The peculiar excellence of Handlin's editing lies in the extent to which his selections of speculations suggest a definition of our American national character.

In a handsome volume subtending the years from 1780 to 1939 and including the pronouncements of forty travelers, half of whom were either German or French in origin, all of whom were continental Europeans, Mr. Handlin has collected an interesting array of opinions. Resisting "the temptation . . . to lean heavily on the well-known authors who were successful at once and whose reputation has snowballed steadily since the publication of their works," the editor has been sparing with Peter Kalm, Crèvecoeur, Brissot de Warville, de Toqueville and others of their kind, and he has taken three-fourths of the contributors from among lesser lights, thus insuring the collection a freshness and worth meriting a wider audience. Scarcely an aspect of American life has gone unnoticed, although the editing places the emphasis on social and economic problems with correspondingly less attention paid to political institutions, a not unnatural choice since English opinion has been arbitrarily excluded from the volume. The cohesive agent which gives the collection unity is the preoccupation with the gradual emergence of the American character.

The people Moreau de Saint Mery saw in the 1790's were difficult to understand because of their diversity of origin. They seemed incapable of any real enthusiasm and were quite lacking in dignity in money matters. The only characteristics held in common appeared to be a love-and-fear of the British and a common economic way of life. During the early decades of the nineteenth century, impelled by dual forces of nationalism and evangelism, these Americans led one traveler to exclaim:

> Properly to describe this country one must speak eternally of the same things, the churches, the sects, the sermons, religious zeal and political fanaticism, revolution, patriots, insurrections, the great achievements of the Americans, their superiority over the English, the French, the whole world. . . .

The religious and political aberrations of the ante-bellum half-century: the Millerites, the Shakers, the celibate Rappites, the Mormans; log-rolling, "pipe-laying," the phalanstery at Redbank, New Jersey, all attracted the attention of the European visitor. Brash arrogance was everywhere apparent.

As the nineteenth century progressed the wholesale migrations from Europe coupled with the ever-expanding territorial resources which were

exploited under conditions of practically unlimited freedom encouraged ambitions which left no room for the ideal life, and "the drive for self-improvement and for material profits" became for the time being the only goals evident to European travelers. The cry of Mammon was borne back across the waters of the Atlantic, and Israel J. Benjamin said sententiously, "Before any improvement there will first have to come the slow formation of a class, secure in position and interested in public life, an aristocratic core, ultimately able to lead the masses." The corruption within governments during the "dreadful decade" following the Civil War elicited the opinion that "when corruption spreads for several years down to the people from above there can no longer be any morality in politics." The mushrooming of big business in the post-war era and the attendant evils of laissez-faire led Baron von Hübner to remark that whereas in the old world the state claimed too much and the individual obtained too little the reverse of the maxim in America, where there was insufficient control of public opinion must result in a nation in which "there is no subjection to an admitted authority recognized by everyone." The Civil War had proved the indissolubility of the political union but relations between the government and the economic life of its citizens remained to be defined.

The gradual emergence of a homogeneous American seemed to a Russian, Peter A. Demens, in 1895 to be the result of economic and social leveling factors, chief among which was the public school system. "The great mass of people in the United States, despite differences in material conditions, is relatively on the same level of mental development." The highly organized and free press played a leading role also in this standardization. The churches served as powerful instruments of union and social intercourse in their more limited spheres. Demens, or "Tverskoy," found some interesting pressures existing within the American labor system which were conducive to national uniformity. He commented on the unusual mobility of the labor supply and the American "passion for a change of residence." The national labor unions tended to unite men of different interests and localities. Most important of all the absence of a sharp difference between physical and mental labor fostered, he believed, a "comparative equality in the material relations of the bulk of the population."

The twentieth century brought the American nation its "burdens of maturity," and visitors to the United States were amazed to discover that this people, once thought to be the leaders in radical reform, were now years behind the times. The decade of the 1920's found the middle class press on guard against anything but "100 per cent Americanism." No crime was too abominable to be linked by it with radicalism, socialism, and bolshevism. Labor in America was conservative "partly due to the antiquated policies of the American Federation of Labor," but principally due to the temper of the American workingman himself, who still clung

to the nineteenth-century dream of escaping into the ranks of the *entrepreneur*. When the New Deal philosophy of a controlled economy produced "the earsplitting clamor of Tory Americans," Madame Odette Keun found it hard to sympathize with people who fought over measures which had become part and parcel of European social philosophy forty years earlier. The European traveler who was quite sure that economic liberty was a thing of the past still envied the American his freedom of conscience, freedom of thought, freedom of expression, however. It was this intellectual freedom which belied the charge of an artificial unity. André Maurois in 1939, commenting on our basic common unity, included the economic interdependence of the sections, "a curious unity of habits and thoughts" created by movies, magazines, radio, etc. But, he concluded, "Most of the citizens of the United States are united by a common faith; they believe in their institutions and in the virtues of liberty. They believe in the possibility of a better future for a free people. They even hope that an understanding of free people everywhere will some day prevent most wars. In a word, they are optimists."

Too often the editor of a book is lost in the shadow of the material he presents. Mr. Handlin deserves high praise for the selection and arrangement of his source materials. *This Was America* would make an excellent companion volume to any good text in American political history. It is a storehouse of provocative comment all history teachers should welcome.

ANNABELLE M. MELVILLE

St. Joseph's College
Emmitsburg

The Negro in the United States. By E. FRANKLIN FRAZIER. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1949. Pp. xxxi, 767. $8.00.)

This is a remarkable book. It contains the results of the successful application of scientific methods, largely historical, to a very wide field and a most pressing problem. The field is the place of the Negro in American life and history; the problem is the relation of the Negro in the future to the other parts of the American community. A vast amount has been written on various aspects of the Negro in the United States. Dr. Frazier makes exhaustive use of this material and for the first time integrates it into an organic whole. The dynamic character of the work here presented is based on two questions which dominate the author's approach to his subject. These are: 1) how has the Negro in this country arrived at his present condition? 2) what are his prospects for the future?

Dr. Frazier writes objectively and avoids bias. Nevertheless, he is forced by facts to the conclusion, expressed in hundreds of varied observa-

tions, that what the Negro is today, he has become not on account of any inherent "racial" qualities, but because of his experiences. He does not emphasize the moral responsibility that this conclusion throws upon the "race" that has determined so largely the experiences of the Negro, but lets the facts speak for themselves. The work is divided into six parts: the Negro under the slave regime; emancipation and accommodation to the new status; the Negro community in its various present forms; intellectual life and leadership; problems of adjustment to the conditions of modern life; prospects for the integration of the Negro into American society. These parts are in turn sub-divided into twenty-eight chapters. The whole is well balanced in its distribution of emphasis.

The author has been most generous and painstaking in his inclusion of tables, maps, diagrams, footnotes, bibliography, and indices. The style, too, is worthy of commendation, as its clarity and simplicity helps make light work of reading a text much of which is necessarily statistical. These and other virtues of this volume are the more fortunate in that the public that is interested in the Negro question, will find Dr. Frazier's work indispensable. *The Negro in the United States* does not say the last word on the subject of race, but it says as much on the branch of the subject with which it deals, as the general public is prepared to hear, and it lays an excellent foundation for future progress in the right direction.

JOHN PERRY PRITCHETT

Queens College
of the
City of New York

The Southern Colonies in the Seventeenth Century, 1607-1689. By WESLEY FRANK CRAVEN. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1949. Pp. xv, 451. $6.00.)

Have you ever wondered why the southerner is different from his fellow American? Have you ever wondered how he came to acquire his particular culture? If you have, you can find the answer in the volume under review, for its author has gone to the root of southern culture and has traced its origin and development during the years 1607 to 1689.

This work is Volume I of A History of the South, a ten-volume co-operative enterprise of southern history and culture from 1607 to the present time, under the co-editorship of Wendell H. Stephenson and E. Merton Coulter. It is the third volume to appear in the series which seeks to present, under the auspices of the Littlefield Fund for Southern History of the University of Texas, a cultural history of the South, more definitive and more accurate than its twelve-volume predecessor, *The South in the Building of the Nation* (1909).

Craven brings to his study of the beginnings of the South a background rich in the research of the early English settlements in Virginia and Bermuda, a background which enables him to write with accuracy and authority. After framing his thesis that the South was first British and then American, the author, through a careful analysis of the development of the aristocratic county system and local government in the Chesapeake region, the growth of colonial trade based upon tobacco and like staples, and the influence of the Anglican religion in the colonies weaves the pattern of the early foundations of southern culture. He opens his study with an introductory section on the background of the English settlements in the new world (1606-1624), discussing the interesting and useful roles the Spaniard played in English exploration, the formation of the London Company, and the "trial by error" foundations of Roanoke and Jamestown. This is followed by a lengthy treatment of the settlements of Virginia and Maryland on the Chesapeake, the ensuing Civil War, the Interregnum and Restoration, and the opening of the Carolinas to the explorer from England and Virginia. In eleven chapters the author has presented the southern colonies of the seventeenth century well. In seeking out the forces which influenced the English colonies, Craven, as one trained in the imperialistic school of history, places emphasis upon the social, political, and economic facets of colonial life. England, through her economic policy of imperialism, fashioned the Chesapeake colonies of Virginia and Maryland as taps of unlimited wealth for the future; and by her social and political rivalries she begot and brought to fruition the region of the Carolinas as a haven for the discontent. With things English being gradually adapted to the colonial frontier, with the fusing of the political and economic pattern of Virginia, the religious and social tolerance of Maryland, and the disturbing factors of a civil war, a Bacon's Rebellion, and general discontent, the genesis of a tradition that did much to transform the English colonist into an American becomes evident.

This volume is a welcome change from the ordinary history of the South in which each state is reviewed chronologically. The search for the factors that fashioned southern culture brings life to the usual factual narration of the various colonial settlements and their individual problems. The author considers well the story of Baltimore's Newfoundland essay and his "toleration" settlement of Maryland, treating briefly but accurately the religious character of this new "land of sanctuary." Virginia, finding a favorite and familiar spot in the author's interest, looms forth as the matrix, first among her neighbors in origin, largest in territory, and most influential, an augury of her future role as Mother of Presidents. Carolina, where the Scotsman saw "the brightest prospects for his countryman," receives a sympathetic analysis from the hand of a native son.

In a word, the author has produced a book, readable and scholarly, interesting and authoritative. But the best feature of this treatise is the critical essay on authorities which is indicative not only of the scholarship of Professor Craven, but of the erudite nature, the authoritative character, and the definitiveness of the whole project of this history of the South. The reader will notice, however, in the treatment of the Jesuits in Maryland (p. 231) and in the essay on authorities, the omission of a few references, such as the invaluable four-volume work of Hughes, *The History of the Society of Jesus in North America, Text, 1580-1773; Documents, 1605-1838,* (New York, 1907-1917), which contains many items not found in Hall, *Narratives of Early Maryland.*

The reader might desire a more comprehensive and a more analytical discussion of the Spaniards' influence in the Carolinas and Florida and the appearance of a few more flesh-and-bone characters like the Richard Hakluyts, Captain Thorpe, and Culpepper (who seldom appear in the average history). But the reader, professional or lay, could not seek a more tolerant, balanced, and interesting narrative based upon the facts now extant.

WILLIAM J. FLETCHER

St. Mary's Seminary
Baltimore

Father Knickerbocker Rebels. New York City during the Revolution. By THOMAS JEFFERSON WERTENBAKER. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1948. Pp. xv, 308. $4.50.)

Thomas J. Wertenbaker has a deservedly high reputation as a stylist in historical writing and his latest volume does nothing to subtract from this renown. But *Father Knickerbocker Rebels* raises again the depressing inquiry as to the remedy for the infrequency with which fine style and solid scholarship are combined in works which are ground out for popular consumption. Dr. Wertenbaker's account of New York City during the American Revolution does very little to support his publishers' claims that he ranks as "one of America's most distinguished scholars."

This volume which is said be "enriched by scores of papers and documents which have hitherto been unavailable," and "is carefully annotated and thoroughly documented," is none of these things. This account of the years 1776-1783 is based upon nine parts of Stokes' *Iconography of Manhattan Island,* one part of the Sir Guy Carleton Papers, and two parts of materials located in the Clements Library. Shaken well together by the skillful hands of the urbane author, these sources produce what should more accurately be entitled: Isaac N. Phelps Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island,* Volume V, Part I, revised and adapted by Thomas J.

Wertenbaker. True, in his preface, the author pays a passing bow to Stokes; but in the footnotes, which are a historian's nightmare, no indication is given that the innumerable quotations from American newspapers, British gazettes, private diaries, journals, even Ford's *Writings of George Washington*, are all to be found in Stokes, handily arranged in chronological order.

This reviewer has no quarrel with Stokes' monumental collection. To the contrary, Dr. Wertenbaker's volume does a very real service in bringing to light these materials which are frequently hard to get at. (The Library of Congress keeps the *Iconography* in the maps division, while the New York State Library in Albany hides it away in archives and manuscripts.) The only complaint relates to the manner in which the annotation disguises the fact that what appears to be a heroic task of research was already done for the author. Further, the materials used from the papers of Sir Guy Carleton, now at Colonial Williamsburg, are by no means new. These papers, often designated as the Dorchester Papers have long since been useful to research through the *Report on American Manuscripts in the Royal Institute of Great Britain*, and were frequently cited by Stokes in the *Iconography*. Finally, the use to which the Clinton Papers, etc., from the Clements Library are put is far from brilliant. To cite only one instance, in his discussion of Howe's decision to go to Philadelphia in 1777 instead of attempting to assist Burgoyne, Wertenbaker falls far short of the excellent treatment given this subject by Jane Clark in the *American Historical Review* for April, 1930. The Clark study used the Clinton and Germain Papers which eighteen years later are classified as part of "a mass of documentary material recently made available."

The simple fact is, of course, that *Father Knickerbocker Rebels* was not written for historians. With the exception of Oscar Barck's Columbia University dissertation, the author pointedly ignores all the excellent work done by Flick, Van Tyne, Albion, East, Abbot, and the rest on the subject of New York and the Revolution. Wertenbaker dismisses the recent researches re-examining the causes of the Revolution with the remark, "Though these scholars have thrown welcome light on many points, their labors have resulted chiefly in obscuring the obvious." He is content to posit as axiomatic such debatable theses as: "The founders of the colonies had brought with them all the rights of Englishmen, the most important of which was the right to self government;" or "The Americans rebelled in spite of the economic situation, not because of it;" or, "no matter what the exigencies of the military situation" the Howes had no right to deprive citizens of the right to trial by jury by their peers.

In spite of these defects, which are primarily defects in Mr. Wertenbaker's concept of historical integrity, *Father Knickerbocker Rebels* is very much worth reading. It depicts with a nice balance of suavity and

spice the city which was at the same time "a nest of traitors," "a leprosy colony," to the patriots while it remained for the British their chief outpost of authority in America and became for the loyalists their only "oasis in the vast Revolutionary desert." The reader sees the events of the conflict through the eyes of pastor Shewkirk, Judge Jones, Dr. Richard Bayley, and scores of other residents who made New York their home during those exciting years. By ignoring the occasional anachronism of a Goebbels or an atom bomb the reader can be pleasantly transported back to the eighteenth century via the flowing prose of the volume and the copious illustrations which interspace its pages.

ANNABELLE M. MELVILLE

St. Joseph's College
Emmitsburg

American Tobacco and Central European Policy: Early Nineteenth Century. By SISTER MARY ANTHONITA HESS. (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1948. Pp. x, 199. $2.25.)

One of the most serious problems which faced the United States from the moment of its birth was that of foreign relations. In the informing study under review the tobacco interests in the new-born nation are singled out as a pressure group influencing the course of American diplomacy. In the opening chapters Sister Anthonita describes the cultivation and regulation of tobacco in the American colonies and its introduction into Europe. She traces the development of the international tobacco trade through the adjustment period following the close of the Napoleonic wars. This was the period of negotiation of commercial treaties between the United States and central European countries. It was followed by another period, more vital in a diplomatic sense, in which overtures were made, first by one side and then by the other for establishment of regular diplomatic relations between the United States and the respective countries. They culminated in direct relations with Prussia (1835), Austria (1838), Naples (1838), and Sardinia (1840). It is the author's thesis that these results were promoted by the commercial interests of American tobacco planters. She emphasizes particularly their efforts in the fourth decade of the nineteenth century, when they put heavy pressure upon the federal government to use diplomatic means to secure the removal of restrictive measures undertaken by foreign nations against the importation of United States tobacco into their dominions. However, the tax on tobacco was then, as it is today, a lucrative and relatively acceptable and easy source of revenue and the American representatives could not move the central European countries to change their policies. Nevertheless,

even though the immediate problem of the tobacco planters was not solved, their interests in common with commercial interests in all ages gave dynamics to diplomacy.

Today, when the United States has a cigarette economy around the world, readers will be attracted to this study by its title. They will be rewarded by Sister Anthonita's understanding and illumination of the interplay of economics and politics. They will find value in the analysis of European conditions recorded in the communications of American representatives. Apparently, John Randolph Clay, writing from his post in Vienna in 1839 and 1841, probed accurately Russian foreign policy when he maintained that timelessness was of its essence.

It is the impression created by this work that American interests abroad in the years under scrutiny were usually protected by keen and far-sighted men, culturally at home in the continuity of European history. They were not reformers or "do gooders." In their sound evaluation of European affairs and in their own direct application to the tasks to which they had been appointed they fostered harmony and understanding.

Sister Anthonita has conscientiously prepared an enlightening study in American foreign relations.

EVELENE PETERS

College of Mount Saint Joseph on-the-Ohio

John Quincy Adams and the Foundations of American Foreign Policy. By SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS, Professor of Diplomatic History and Inter-American Relations at Yale University. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1949. Pp. xix, 588, xv. $7.50.)

Thanks to a patient and discerning search in the Adams family papers, heretofore closed to historians, Professor Bemis has cleared away all remaining doubts as to the essential role of John Quincy Adams in the definition of early American foreign policy. The final chapter of this elaborate and convincing study summarizes the main points of that policy so as to itemize what the conscientious reader cannot fail to learn, that nearly every expression of it owed something to an Adams, either to Adams senior, to 1801, or to John Quincy Adams, to the end of the latter's unhappy term as sixth President of the United States. This is a long book and quite an event in American historiography, but not so great an event as it would have been, say, fifteen years ago. It was in 1935 that the author gave us in *The Diplomacy of the American Revolution* what he intended to be a first volume in a series to cover the foundations of American policy, only to have "a variety of circumstances, including the appearance of excellent books on the diplomatic history of the United States during the period 1783-1826" impel him to "the present

biographical device" to acquit him of his earlier project. Of course, he had himself done a great deal of work on the same period, demonstrating great mastery of the sources in those durable monographs, *Jay's Treaty* (1923), and *Pinckney's Treaty* (1926); he had contributed enormously to the convenience of other scholars by his expedition for the Library of Congress to photocopy material in European archives; and he made his own review of the background of the Monroe Doctrine in *The Latin American Policy of the United States* (1943). The present work has afforded him the opportunity to add to the facts from a repository of manuscripts which deserves maintenance and appreciation as a special category of our state papers. It has also enabled him to show, through the life of his subject to 1826, how much the United States continental *Imperium* was more consistently an Adams notion of the national interest than it was a Jeffersonian or even a Jacksonian notion. Jefferson would have guaranteed to France the west bank of the Mississippi in order to gain New Orleans and the Floridas; Jackson "never did a thing for Oregon." On the other hand, it was John Quincy Adams, down to his great transformation into a northern sectionalist in the years after he left the White House, who fought for a definition of American sovereignty to the maximum limits in every boundary dispute. Besides the well known achievement of the Transcontinental Treaty of 1819, Professor Bemis mentions another preliminary Adams contribution to Manifest Destiny in Senator JQA's defeat of the King-Hawksbury Convention of 1803, which would, if it had been approved by the senate, have closed the gap left by the peace of 1783, between the Lake of the Woods and the source of the Mississippi. Thereafter, thinks Professor Bemis, the westward extension of this territory south of 49° latitude deserved the name, "Adams Strip."

The present work stops at the close of the diplomatist's career; even the story of the President is untold except for a discussion of the foreign affairs. Another biographer may have the pleasure of facing the problem presented by the evolution of the nationalist Adams into a sectionalist, a transition at least as interesting as that of John C. Calhoun. Now that the Adams family has opened the door to a diplomatic historian more than equal to his subject, it is to be hoped that the later story may receive as good a treatment. For the present it is most instructive to be able to contemplate so complete an identity of personal and national causes in one man, in one whose Americanism made him the best of George Washington's disciples. One longs for another Secretary of State who could achieve such detachment in the face of public clamor to save the world by inadequate ideologies, who could view the nation's sympathy for any good cause

as "natural and inevitable," but at the same time wish it to be "not uncontrolable." Professor Bemis has done his share to make this, the cautionary advice of the first generation's greatest diplomatist, available to the present generation's great fumblers.

JOHN T. FARRELL

The Catholic University of America

Immigrant Life in New York City, 1825-1863. By ROBERT ERNST. (New York: King's Crown Press. Columbia University. 1949. Pp. xvi, 331. $4.50.)

The era of the empire city extending from the opening of the Erie Canal to the draft riots of July, 1863, was marked by a constantly progressive increase in the immigrant population. In the decade 1820-1830 about 90,000 came to the port of New York; in the decade that ended in 1860 close to two million entered the large rotunda of Castle Garden. The inevitable social conflicts of this period as a result of the impact of the mass immigration movement upon the native population are generally familiar to the average student of nineteenth-century America.

The author of this volume has made a new and scholarly contribution. As a basis for the essential part of this study he has taken the marshal's manuscript schedules of the *New York State Census of 1855;* this was the first of New York censuses fully to list nativities and it was taken after the great German immigration of the early 1850's. Some thirty-nine pages of statistical charts based upon this and closely related sources are given in the appendix. Ninety-four pages of closely printed and brilliantly annotated notes follow together with a rather comprehensive bibliography. Public documents and an extensive "sampling" of newspapers—the American press, the Catholic, immigrant, and foreign language press—supplied most of the information that the author has woven into a vivid tapestry of tenements, trade, industry, unions, politics, churches, schools and cultural attainment.

In interpreting the varied statistics a logical precision has been attained in the analyses presented that more than meets the established norms of objectivity coupled with lucidity. The reader seldom has occasion to question what is being compared with what and under what circumstances. For example, of "over three thousand foreign-born carters and teamsters in 1855, four-fifths were Irish, one-eighth German, although proportionally few immigrants entered these callings." Again with 1855 as the year for comparison, more than half the employees in the building trades "were born outside the United States, and of these, over half were natives of Ireland and one-fourth of Germany."

With the great emphasis the author places on the foreign language and immigrant press of the day, severe selectivity was inevitable. However, to cite but one instance, in the discussion of the draft riots no reference is made to the New York *Tribune,* the New York *Times,* or the New York *Evening Post* for events in July, 1863. This volume will, nevertheless, be fundamental for all future historians of this period.

JOSEPH G. DWYER

College of Mount Saint Vincent

Rock of Chickamauga: The Life of General George H. Thomas. By FREEMAN CLEAVES. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press. 1948. Pp. xi, 328. $3.75.)

This reviewer's first reaction upon picking up Mr. Cleaves' biography of General Thomas was compounded of gratitude and hope. Gratitude that Thomas was to get the modern recognition he deserves, and hope that the author had found the answers to some questions which have long bothered students of the man and his associates. Cleaves has effectively reasserted Thomas' claim to the acclaim and respect of the American people; he has traced his career carefully; he has explained, probably as well as possible, the reasons for the treatment Thomas received during and after the war. He has written an interesting biography of a fine man and very capable general.

The biographer of Thomas, while he has readily available the official record of the war, many volumes of recollections and reminiscences of participants, and some heated controversial writings has relatively little purely personal Thomas material from which to draw. There is no diary, no volume of memoirs, no large file of personal correspondence to reveal what or how Thomas thought about the little things of life or about the big issues. There results a real difficulty in getting inside of the man, and the difficulty is but partially removed by the official letters and reports of the general and by the anecdotes related by his associates. What thoughts went through Thomas' mind before he decided not to go with his state as his fellow Virginian, Lee, had done, we do not know. His resentment at the treatment accorded him by Grant, Sherman, and the administration we can learn from the official papers, but just how he appraised those men, Lincoln, Johnson, and many others we do not know. One cannot blame the author for not supplying the answers to these questions; Thomas did not leave the material. He does well with what was available.

Mr. Cleaves apparently believes that Thomas was one of the greatest tacticians produced by the Civil War, perhaps, one of the greatest of all our history. The reviewer has similar high respect not only for the tactical skill but also for the strategic sense Thomas had. But this study does not

prove the statement. To be sure, plans advanced by Thomas and rejected by Buell, Rosecrans, Sherman, or Grant are given full treatment, but there is not adequate discussion of Thomas' handling of officers and units under his direct command. And while Thomas never lost a battle, he did make mistakes; even at Nashville he failed to provide for the enveloping of Hood's army once he drove it loose. There is not enough of Thomas' theory of command, nor of such new methods as using cavalry as mounted infantry.

The career of Thomas is set off by his relations with Buell, Rosecrans, Grant, Sherman, especially with Sherman. Cleaves does show the relative strength of Thomas in these relations, but he falls into the error characteristic of many Thomas supporters of not seeing anything good, and not recognizing the skills and achievements of the others. The champions of Thomas have less to explain away than do those of Grant or Sherman, but these latter did achieve, and one should be willing to recognize the achievements.

There are a few slips: on page 48 the date should be 1851 instead of 1853; on page 138 two *right* wings. They are minor. One wonders why reports easily available in the *Official Records* are taken so often from secondary accounts. There has been too much ignoring and misusing of the *Records* in other studies, especially biographies, not to insist on their being used consistently. The statement as to the attitude of Catholics towards the war is an unsupported generality, though apparently based on Piatt (p. 117). Some of the maps are too small for effective use, it is not always easy to follow the movements of the several armies, and rarely is the over-all war picture described.

Yet Mr. Cleaves does give us a good portrait of Thomas, a satisfactory account of his career, a good estimate of his abilities and achievements, and a true appreciation of his place in American military history.

P. RAYMOND NIELSON

Creighton University

The University of Wisconsin: A History, 1848-1925. By MERLE CURTI and VERNON CARSTENSEN. Two Volumes. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press. 1949. Pp. xviii, 739; x, 668. $10.00 per set. $6.00 per volume.)

Representing a major event in historical writing, these volumes relate in a masterful manner the history of the University of Wisconsin in its first seventy-five years. The authors have successfully attained their objective of showing the development of the idea of a state university together with the backgrounds of the social and intellectual movements in the Middle West. The volumes deal with the origin of the idea related

to a state university; its beginnings (1836-1866); the new foundations (1866-1887); college to university (1887-1903); and the university in the twentieth century (1903-1925). Everywhere in the work there is alert and skilled emphasis on the triple functions of the university which involve research, teaching, and the dissemination of knowledge through extension service.

Throughout the stress is on the gallant effort to keep cultural objectives and work from being eliminated. These volumes betray a sort of elusive nostalgia for an outstanding course and record in the humanities. At times the candid narrative indicates that the university yielded to the spirit of an age dominated by secularism, democracy, pragmatism, science, and technocracy. It is not difficult to agree that a college of liberal arts is the core of a university and the handmaiden for its technical schools. In this important matter the authors conclude sympathetically that the liberal arts college at the university neither failed nor succeeded in its mission.

One of the best portions of the canvas is allotted to the perennial struggle of the university with its regents over policies and requirements, and with the legislature for funds. This feature of the story, despite its dependence on the interplay of the intricate forces related to political groups, interested classes, and stubborn personalities, may be easily selected as the chief contribution in the work.

The history of the faculty offers outlines of personalities, their aims, courses, and methods, and includes full length portraits, thumb-nail sketches, and one line characterizations. President Van Hise (1903-1918) receives a lion's share of notice, possibly because his secularism fitted best into the current pattern. He had no philosophy but exhibited a positivistic way of thinking towards life, science, and religion. For instance, in the problem of academic freedom he was swayed by pragmatism. Believing in the pre-eminent role of experts, Van Hise practically entertained ideas about the people which are dear to the police state. Though he expressed repugnance to the phrase "the Wisconsin Idea," he was not adverse to blessing the union of experts and politicians which eventually resulted in a dynastic "bossism" for the state.

There is too much confused lamentation and spilling of ink over the question of academic freedom. President Edward A. Birge (1918-1925) appears alone in piercing the fog about this problem. He rightly distinguished between regulatory measures and constitutional provisions respecting freedom of speech when the issue involved the appearance of outsiders on a university platform. Not the least contribution is afforded by the outlines which depict the aim, attitude, and action of the university regarding a central school board, the state superintendent of education, the public school system, and the normal schools. This story in general

indicates a monopolistic tendency which, however, was pretty much curbed at times.

Student life, ideas, and interests receive a fair amount of space and treatment. Their conduct, discipline, government, societies, fraternities, publications, housing, and studies are ably sketched. Student escapades, rowdyism, feuding, and academic dishonesty receive more notice than student virtues because minorities get into the news more easily. Athletics are treated adequately. There seems to be a justifiable note of regret about the preponderant role which contemporary athletics have assumed.

Of the schools the College of Agriculture and Extension Division receive extended treatment. Because these schools specialize in extra-mural activities, they captured the fancy of politicians, or were themselves taken over, and so they received more publicity and support than the other schools.

Attention may be directed to some of the accomplishments of the university. It pioneered in the Middle West in the social sciences on an advanced level; its leadership was notable in the study of American history, in the history of pharmacy, in research materials for the history of American labor, in the union of pure and applied mathematics, and in instruction in speech. The work of the College of Agriculture in plant pathology is as important as its discovery of the milk-fat test. The story of the beginnings and development of all the colleges, schools, departments, and courses is impressively narrated.

These volumes expose a positivistic ideology which is the real, though fugitive, shaper of the university. Throughout there is an unwarranted optimism, it seems, concerning an institution of higher learning which is given over largely to ephemeral, though utilitarian, services. The university by spreading itself too widely may impress observers as being shallow.

When dealing with students, liberalism, and services, a few general statements hardly have sufficient support. Careful readers will note with astonishment the introduction of thinly disguised contempt for, or ironic criticism of, private or denominational schools. Throughout the volumes there is an atmosphere of complacent boasting which, however, does not mar the presentation of inexorable facts.

These volumes are drawn from a wealth of sources, well indicated in the footnotes, and include a bibliographical essay, income and expense reports, an address of President Van Hise (1913), and a good index.

PETER LEO JOHNSON

St. Francis Seminary
Milwaukee

Labor in America. A History. By FOSTER RHEA DULLES. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co. Pp. 402. $4.50.)

A non-economist has at last presented what he calls very properly a history of labor—not trade unionism—in what he might have more properly termed the United States, not America. He fulfills his stated purpose of gauging the book for the "general reader." Hence the intricacies of labor laws of the later period are capsuled and an unstrained reader's interest maintained in this useful volume. Symmetrically the twenty chapters run to about twenty pages apiece except for the brief postscript. These last five pages are symptomatic of the work as a whole. Professor Dulles writes as a disinterested observer using the standard studies, particularly as they touch on national movements in labor, without aligning himself with any school of thought and veering neither to capital nor to organized labor, except one see an inclination to the right in a fear of labor's might as a potential threat to American democracy (pp. 127, 379-380). It is a narrative history with a minimum of interpretation beyond such accepted maxims on labor's consistent decline with depressions up to the 1890's and the less agreed upon explanation of Jacksonian democracy as resting on working class support. The author relates background and the life of the laboring man after the manner of the social historian rather than the economic one. His dips into what are more primary sources seem to be confined largely to newspapers. The origin of only very few items—even direct quotations—is indicated so that the more serious student will find only bibliographical notes given by chapters at the end of the book to guide him to further study. Such popular writing overlooks the fact that some statements at least are only as good as the authority of their source.

From a picture of colonial free labor the author follows through with the beginnings of unionization, the utopian phase, industrialization, nationalization, upheaval and the other divisions made commonplace by the more cumbersome Commons volumes. Personalities and strike turmoil rather than such things as either "an elaborate system of phalanxes" (p. 80) or "a highly complicated compromise" of Lewis and Ickes (p. 341) come in for elaboration. The New Deal, a more uncharted area of labor history, is rightly called "a momentous watershed in the history of the labor movement." Some, however, will question the account of the A.F. of L.-C.I.O. split which emphasizes the ideological differences of craft vs. industrial unionism rather than the question of the craft unions being faced with the problem of surrendering jurisdictional claims in mass production industries. Likewise the close comparing of the job-conscious C.I.O. and the anti-monopoly reformist Knights of Labor is open to dispute.

Readers of this *Review* may care to note that the best evidence does not equate the Molly Maguires with the Ancient Order of Hibernians (p. 117) and that the Church-Knights of Labor episode needs qualification and chronological rearrangement (p. 133). (The author might have dropped "Noble and Holy Order" in the Knights' title after they did so themselves, e.g., pp. 157, 160.) American Catholics may blame themselves in part if organized labor has been constantly about half Catholic in membership while the influence of socio-religious thought on its programs and policies does not even find an allusion in such a survey as this volume, based on monograph studies. They may be more patient about notice being given to organized Catholic effort of the past decade or so to influence trade unionism in a democratic direction. How a major blemish on organized labor, which is shared in common with American society, viz., the plight of the minority Negro worker group, is so ignored—even to a lack of mention of the F.E.P.C.—is more difficult to understand. Professor Dulles, it is said, is presently working on a history of the American Red Cross.

HENRY J. BROWNE

The Catholic University of America

Protestant Churches and Industrial America. By HENRY F. MAY. (New York: Harper & Bros. 1949. Pp. x, 297. $3.50.)

American Protestant social thought and action in the nineteenth century has been the subject of several sound books but none quite so excellent as this. Earlier works have emphasized the rise of the social gospel and the development of the institutional church, the outstanding accomplishments of social Protestantism in this area. By devoting scrupulous attention to all sides of Protestant social thought between 1828 and 1895 Dr. May presents a balanced picture and an accurate estimate of the influence of both the progressive and conservative elements of social Protestantism.

The first hundred pages describe the process by which the principles of classical political economy, so often associated with irreligion abroad, were tamed by the leading Protestant thinkers in the years before the Civil War and made part of the standard repertoire of every successful minister. This clerical laissez-faireism, by no means unknown in contemporaneous American Catholicism, made Protestantism and the triumphant middle classes perfect allies but alienated in large measure the working class from the leading churches. The social gospel, developed in the 1880's and 1890's by the "moderately progressive" wing of social Protestantism, was thus not a re-entry of American Protestantism into the world of social and economic problems, but a new approach to those

problems. Many influential groups within Protestantism never concurred in this new criticism, maintaining to the end of the century and beyond the old preference for laissez-faire as part of the divine law. Dr. May adds little to the accounts of the rise of the social gospel previously offered by Charles Hopkins and Aaron Abell, but his estimate of its influence among Protestants generally is both original and provocative. By 1895 it had won over prominent figures in every important sect. It had effectively challenged the reigning complacent social and economic orthodoxy within Protestantism, and it was to become a leading element in the reform movement of the progressive era which, thanks to the social gospel, was to receive general clerical approval. Yet it had by no means conquered Protestantism and it had conspicuously failed to bring the working classes within the fold. It remained always what it was from the beginning, a middle-class reform movement.

There are too many excellent things about this work to be mentioned here. Students of American Catholic social thought will be struck by the number of parallels to their own field, not the least of which is Dr. May's demonstration of the effect which the great strike of 1877, the industrial crisis of 1886, and the Homestead and Pullman strikes of the early 1890's had in destroying complacency on the social question. The faults in the book are minor. Henry D. Lloyd, Edward Bellamy, and Henry George were, in their several ways, religious men but their views owed little to the social gospel. Terence V. Powderly is a much less reliable critic than Dr. May thinks. None of this should obscure the fact that this is the best all-around book on its subject yet produced.

JAMES EDMUND ROOHAN

Yale University

American Social Reform Movements. Their Pattern Since 1865. By THOMAS H. GREER. (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1949. Pp. ix, 313. $4.00.)

Mr. Greer has written a compact and workmanlike history of social reform since 1865, concentrating on labor, the farmers, the radicals, and the middle class and eschewing such limited movements as women suffrage and temperance. The activities described include the familiar ones under these categories. In dealing with labor, for instance, the author presents good brief accounts of the National Labor Union, the Knights of Labor, the American Federation of Labor, the "New Unionism" of the 1920's, and the C. I. O. Labor's sporadic essays in politics and its relations with radicalism are also discussed. In similar fashion the highlights in each of the other divisions are covered. The emphasis, quite properly in such a work, is on the period since 1917. In the final chapters the author

brings the book down to the opening of the current year and crawls cautiously out on a limb to predict in broad terms future prospects in social reform. This is a textbook, not a work of research, and in the main the author has relied frankly, though with discrimination and scrupulous acknowledgment, on recognized authorities.

The book is notable for two things. Mr. Greer has done a commendable job of compressing his complex subject matter into a small space (too small, indeed, to be quite adequate) while keeping his story clear and balanced. Secondly, there is the question of method. The work is part of the Prentice-Hall Sociology Series and is, presumably, intended as a background for courses in that field on contemporary social and economic reform movements. In keeping with standard sociological approach the author has concentrated on the patterns found in social reform. He is too good a historian to make easy generalizations or to exaggerate the similarities of different reform movements, but its brevity and this avowed search for pattern combine to make the book a little too neat around the edges. Each of the major topics is a well-packaged unit with few of the rag-tag ends that historians, sometimes to the annoyance of social scientists, persist in finding. There are patterns in the book (on the whole well and cautiously laid out), but there is a rather remarkable absence of events. It may well be that no current American history textbooks quite perform the task for which this work is intended, but because of its extreme brevity and of its preoccupation with pattern at the expense of "the imperfect, the contingent, and the unique," it risks distorting American history, especially for the new student. Whoever has had a sound course in American history will find little new here; whoever has not will find that history rather trimmer and more coherent than it was.

Yale University JAMES EDMUND ROOHAN

Labor Relations in the New York Rapid Transit Systems, 1904-1944. By JAMES J. MCGINLEY, S.J. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1949. Pp. xxiii, 635. $6.50.)

Leaders in industry, public utilities, and publicly-owned undertakings will learn much from this volume. Moreover, graduate students and their mentors in the fields of sociology, economics, political science, and labor-management will prize possession of it. It is a researcher's delight. The author apparently has been exhaustive in his task and is to be commended for his success in the compression of his complex data. The varied items of company contracts, finances, industrial plant, operating details, legal technicalities, trade unions, skilled crafts, wages, hours, working conditions are all ably condensed within his three important sections: the

industry; the worker; conclusions. An epilogue wisely extends his treatment to January, 1947.

Father McGinley by a very careful analysis provides his readers with an intelligent understanding of the development of labor relations in the New York rapid transit situation. He treats all its phases: public utility employment, government ownership employment, and civil service. The soundness of his many conclusions will elicit admiration. Readers will also benefit by the expert application where necessary of Christian morality to the labor-management problems involved. The chapter on employee organizations has a special value because it demonstrates that the present strong union, the Transport Workers Union (TWU-CIO), was not a sudden phenomenon since it had numerous predecessors.

Those involved in the actual history of the industry may object to the author's ascribing materialism as the only reason for workers who were largely Catholic continuing to accept union leadership that was often suspected of communism (pp. 321-322). Fear by the rank-and-file of the economic and legal sanctions in the hands of a tightly controlled officialdom was a major factor here. The author indicates this earlier when he refers to the disadvantages that beset any "overarticulate minorities" (p. 291). Many will remember that the union members were not always apathetic about voting for officials (p. 322). The 1939 elections are a case in point. It might also be said that the author has concerned himself too much with the operating details and not expanded enough the treatment of labor relations as such. In other words, his work is more an analysis than a history.

Despite these criticisms Father McGinley's work will remain a chief source book for investigating transit problems. In his preface he mentions that another book is still necessary on the subject. With this volume as background, perhaps, the next one could be a genuine history of the subject because there is here a colorful and arresting story—one that should be told in full.

THOMAS J. DARBY

Cathedral College
New York

LATIN AMERICAN HISTORY

The Spanish Struggle for Justice in the Conquest of America. By LEWIS HANKE. Published for the American Historical Association. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press. 1949. Pp. xi, 217. $3.50.)

Of late years, in the rush to eradicate the blots of the Black Legend from appraisals of Spanish colonial enterprise in the Americas, there has

been a tendency to turn Fray Bartolomé de las Casas into the No. 1 whipping boy. Rightfully or otherwise, he has been blamed as one of the unwitting but very real factors contributing to its growth. This has caused too many writers to overlook the real las Casas, a sincere, energetic, zealous, if somewhat idealistic Spaniard who stood for an aspect of the conquest which has been too consistently overlooked. Las Casas is not simply a personality, with virtues and faults; he is a symbol, the most prominent, active, and articulate member of a considerable segment of Spaniards who shared both his ideals and his scruples. The present work is not a biography of the famous Dominican, though he is, perforce, one of its principal characters. This study concerns itself with the persons, ideas, debates, policies, and actual experiments which made up the attempt on the part of the Spaniards to range justice on their side as they went about the conquest of America. It tells the story of the *conquistador*-Indian relationships on the level, not so much of actual events, as of the theories which furnished motivation for attitudes and actions.

That there was a struggle for justice in the conquest of America may seem as novel and surprising to folk nurtured on the Black Legend, which has made every Spaniard a rascal, cruel, rapacious, sadistic even, as the fact is consoling to those who feel that, despite all their human faults, the Spaniards did a great work in their conquest and colonization of America. In the opinion of this reviewer this book has a number of truly significant merits: in the first place it is an example of meticulous and enlightened research which shows the author's deep acquaintance with facets of the colonial story too often by-passed by historians, viz., the mass of material which came from the pens of Spain's philosophers and theologians, moralists and political theorists concerning expansion overseas; again, it contributes to a better understanding of the generation of the *conquistadores,* in which must be counted, if the cause of historical truth is to be properly served, many, many high-minded, splendidly motivated, and magnificently intentioned men, alongside of the more vividly portrayed and highly publicized money-mad slave masters and heartless oppressors; and, finally, by indirection it deals a body blow to the Black Legend in a manner much more effective than has been done by the outright and not always too convincing *apologias* of recent times.

The Albert J. Beveridge Prize of the American Historical Association for 1947, which went to the author for this work, was awarded with fine discrimination and to the best interests of superior historical scholarship.

JOHN FRANCIS BANNON

Saint Louis University

The Audiencia of New Galicia in the Sixteenth Century. A Study in Spanish Colonial Government. By J. H. PARRY. (Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Macmillan Co. 1948. Pp. 205. $3.00.)

This volume deals chiefly with the *audiencia* before its reorganization. This takes up the first part of the volume, entitled "The Subordinate Audiencia, 1548-1572" (pp. 14-132), whereas the second and shorter part, "The Audiencia and the Royal Chancellery, 1572-1600" (pp. 133-196), describes the make-up and relates its activity after the reorganization. In the first part, after two introductory chapters on "The Conquest of New Galicia" and "The Foundation of the Audiencia," the author portrays in three chapters the functioning of the *audiencia* in its relations with the Indians, the *conquistadores,* and the Church, concluding this part with a chapter on "The Reorganization of the Audiencia, 1570-1572." The second part of the volume tells us in three chapters how, after its reorganization, the *audiencia* was administered, what its extent of jurisdiction and method of procedure were, and why conflicts arose between this and other government agencies. In the "Conclusion" the results of the author's investigation are summarized. The absence of a bibliography is made up for by numerous footnote references. There are two appendixes and a map of Mexico showing the area known as New Galicia at the time.

Dr. Parry is at his best when tracing the development and delineating the make-up of the *audiencia* as an institution of Spanish colonial administration. In this respect the study is a notable and commendable contribution to early Mexican history. Here the author's chief sources of information, carefully and minutely investigated, are the well-known *Recopilación de las leyes de Indias* and manuscripts preserved in the national archives of Spain and Mexico.

There is much to object to, however, in the work when it comes to the author's interpretation and correlation of known or at least knowable facts relative to the *audiencia* before its reorganization. Chapter V, dealing with "The Audiencia and the Church" (pp. 97-120), needs a thorough revision before it can be accepted as sound history. One need be neither a Catholic nor a Franciscan to find fault with the author's procedure and judgment in the case of Bishop Pedro de Ayala (pp. 108-120). At times, in his quarrels with the *oidores* and other worthies, Ayala may have acted rashly and imprudently. However, in all the incidents cited in this volume relative to these quarrels the bishop as head of the diocese was certainly within his rights and doing his duty as he saw it. It would have been safer to present in this case the testimony of the Franciscan chronicler, Antonio Tello, than to reject it *a priori* on the ground that for Tello "a Franciscan could do no wrong" (p. 108). Jorge Pérez had "no power to absolve the *oidores,*" as the author declares; and when he did, it was under compulsion; wherefore, it is incorrect to say that "the victory of the *oidores*

was thus complete" (p. 115). Besides concern "for the immunity of his House and Order" (p. 115), there was conceivably at least one other reason why Fray Angel de la Valencia supported the bishop in his conflict with the *oidores*. His sermon was, of course, "highly abusive" and the language of the churchmen "intemperate" (p. 115), just as the bishop's "letter of complaint to the king" was "a grossly exaggerated account of the original quarrel" (p. 116). Strange, the *Averiguaciones* of the *oidor* Contreras "make no mention of the miserable conflicts with the second bishop" (Ayala) and "contain no revelations of serious incompentence or dishonesty on the part of the *oidores*" (p. 120). It is a pity that when discussing the conflict between the bishop and the *oidores*, Dr. Parry cites only one source of information, leaves out of consideration the "serious incompetence," the "dishonesty" and other equally serious misdemeanors of the *oidores* (pp. 128-129), and neglects to remind his readers that Ayala was not the first nor the only opponent of the *oidores* (pp. 75, note 2, and 77). Again, it might have been well to point out that Ayala was bishop before (not after) the much-needed reorganization or reform of the *audiencia*.

In the fifth chapter are also other matters of importance that call for comment. Informed readers will wonder what is meant by "men in minor secular orders" (p. 98). They will be disappointed if they look for testimonies confirming the statement that "the secular clergy acquired an unenviable reputation for ignorance and immorality;" that "the records of the episcopal courts—later, of the Inquisition—are full of cases of minor clergy, not in priest's orders, prosecuted for administering the sacraments illegally, for neglecting their work, and for cheating and seducing their charges" (p. 98); that many missionaries "proved idle, immoral, and tyrannical in their dealings with the natives" (p. 99); that "friars could be found who would administer the sacraments to an excommunicate in defiance of episcopal authority" (p. 104); and that solicitation "was extremely prevalent and was always tried by the secret tribunal" of the Inquisition (pp. 119 and 100). Here are five serious allegations. For the first one the author cites Torquemada whose account, however, hardly supports what the author states. For the remaining four allegations the author cites no authority at all. It was certainly in place to remind the reader or at least to take into consideration the fact, admitted by such as have carefully examined the records of the Inquisition, that in ever so many instances recorded "cases" are nothing more than recorded charges; that such recorded charges are not yet prosecutions, however, and least of all convictions.

Attention should be directed also to a few inaccuracies. Fray Gregorio de Beteta was not a Franciscan (p. 53) but a Dominican. Not "Tete" (p. 99) but Tata was the epithet familiarly bestowed upon Bishop Quiroga.

Guardian, not "prior" (p. 115) is the correct title for the superior of a Franciscan friary. Bishops Juan de Zumárraga and Diego de Landa are no longer "condemned from a modern humanitarian point of view . . . for their destruction of Indian pictogrammic writings" (p. 99). Modern researches, begun some fifty years ago by J. García Icazbalceta and carried on by others of more recent date, have made this charge untenable.

To repeat: as a study of the *audiencia* in its legal aspects the volume deserves commendation; not so in point of historical interpretation and correlation of known and knowable facts.

FRANCIS BORGIA STECK

Quincy College

The Mining Guild of New Spain and Its Tribunal General, 1770-1821. By WALTER HOWE. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1949. Pp. ix, 534. $7.50.)

Institutional history in the field of Hispanic American studies has been cultivated with much painstaking effort in recent years. Quite a few monographs have appeared on various detailed aspects of colonial and republican life. One of the latest works in this field is the monograph of Mr. Howe of Harvard. The author spent years of research in the archives of Mexico and Spain assembling the facts which set forth for the first time a lucid exposition of the development of mining legislation, its background, its results, and its importance. One of the oldest and most indispensable of all economic activities in colonial Mexico was mining. Out of the diggings of New Spain poured much of the wealth which became the lifeblood of the trade of Spain and all Europe. By the eighteenth century this industry had assumed vast proportions and in the latter years of that century and in the first two decades of the nineteenth mining enjoyed its greatest period of prosperity.

The author commences his study with a detailed review of the previous development of mining activities under the new code of mining laws which was promulgated under Philip II in 1584 and added to the *Recopilació de Castilla* in 1640. In this legal arrangement the ultimate title and ownership of mines remained with the crown but individuals could freely obtain the right to work them. It was actually possible under this arrangement for a person to discover or work mines of gold or silver with or without the permission of the owner of the surface soil. For 250 years this was the general procedure within which the mining industry developed. By the middle of the eighteenth century, however, the mines in many regions had begun to fall into decay as is evidenced in the work of Francisco Xavier de Gamboa called *Comentarios a las ordenanzas de minas* which

appeared in 1761 listing the condition of all the mining camps of importance in the country. At this time only twenty mining camps were reported to be in regular production. Gamboa advocated the formation of a general company to supply capital to mines.

José de Galvez as Visitor General of New Spain summarized the situation in the *Informe general* of 1771 advocating a new ordinance which would regulate the mining industry on all points which the old laws had omitted. This document of Galvez brought the whole matter to the direct attention of the crown and was ultimately instrumental in the formation of the Cuerpo de Mineria or the Mining Guild. The actual organization came eight years later on May 24, 1777, after many preliminary steps. The Mining Guild was given charge of all activities related in any way to mining and it was to be governed by a tribunal general which would be given jurisdiction "to promote and consider all administrative and economic matters."

The two most important long term results of this organization was first the new mining code of 1783 which after long discussion and some subsequent modification was adopted and regulated all aspects of mining until the end of the colonial period. The second contribution was the famous School of Mines which was provided for under the mining code of 1783. This institution was to license mining engineers throughout the colony. Both of these landmarks, the code of laws and the school, were to influence on the one hand the legal background of republican Hispanic America and parts of the Southwest of the United States, and on the other form a basis for the technical training of mining engineers and for research in mineralogy.

To those professionally engaged in Hispanic studies as well as to the advanced student of history, this work of Mr. Howe is indispensable as an addition to their personal reference library. Here for the first time are brought together many important facts otherwise unobtainable taken directly from original documentary sources which help to make this work a landmark in the study of Hispanic American colonial institutions.

THOMAS E. DOWNEY

University of Notre Dame

Simón Bolívar. By GERHARD MASUR. (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press. 1948. Pp. xii, 737. $6.50.)

Bolívar, were he alive today, would recognize this full-length biography as a most serious and successful effort to portray the life of the South American "Liberator." Masur makes a conscientious endeavor to gather all the available data on his subject and then to picture him with his full equipment of grandeur and frailty. The result will certainly rate the title

of "standard" among books on the man who, with San Martín, gave freedom to all Spanish lands beyond Panama. The author undoubtedly relies heavily on Restrepo's great history of Colombia. And this is reasonable in one who came rather late in life to study the career of the famous man of Caracas. Yet when he undertook that study he certainly went at it thoroughly, as the footnote citations indicate. If nothing more, the volume is a first-rate guide to students of the northern revolutions from 1810 to 1830.

Reviewers of this subject always scrutinize the treatment accorded four events: the dealings with Miranda, the emotional affairs, the meeting at Guayaquil, and the death of the hero. Masur irritates his reader with the first twenty-seven pages of superficial and sometimes contradictory background opinions that could well have been omitted in the interest of the book as a whole. A surprising about-face occurs as soon as the main character enters. From that point on there is nothing opinionated, partisan, eulogistic, or careless in dealing with the difficult and complex human dynamo that was Bolívar. The author stands with Robertson on the several debatable events connected with unhappy Miranda. On Manuela and her lesser imitators, the treatment is factual and commonsense. (Aside from Van Loon, biographers have hitherto gone to extremes in this matter). The famous meeting with San Martín receives delicate and incisive attention, and scholars will look forward to the author's promised monograph on that event whose results were crucial for independence. Finally, the picture of death is true to the documents. The magnificent testament of Bolívar, like that of Daniel O'Connell, is laid down with the reverence becoming a genuine writer of history.

Typographical errors are few and rarely bothersome, although in the appended bibliography Paxson should not have been printed without the "s." Some periods are missing in the page citations. Sometimes the style approaches the theatrical, a pardonable fault where there is great enthusiasm. Not so the content, for a cautious yet sure control directed the entire course of this narrative. It is reliable, complete, and sound.

W. Eugene Shiels

Xavier University
Cincinnati

NOTES AND COMMENTS

At the quarterly meeting of the editors of the REVIEW held on February 4 two new advisory editors were selected. They are Joseph N. Moody, professor of history at Cathedral College, New York, and Paul Kiniery, professor of history and assistant dean of the Graduate School at Loyola University, Chicago. Father Moody did his graduate work at Columbia and Fordham Universities and took the doctorate at the latter in 1934. His field is modern European history with special emphasis on Catholic social thought in nineteenth-century Europe. Mr. Kiniery was trained at the University of Wisconsin where he won the Ph.D. degree in American history in 1929. Both men have contributed to the REVIEW as well as to other Catholic periodicals and journals.

The Committee on Program of the Association for 1950 held its first meeting in Chicago on January 28 to make plans for the sessions to be held at the Hotel Stevens during next Christmas week. James M. Eagan, dean of Lewis College of Science and Technology, is chairman of the committee. Dr. Eagan was joined in Chicago by Donald P. Gavin of John Carroll University and Clarence J. Ryan, S.J., of Marquette University, the other members of the committee.

Among the many churchmen who have served the American Church in a capacity not as quickly forgotten as that of the usual parish priest but still not as well remembered as that of a bishop, was Monsignor Thomas Sim Lee. This descendant of the colonial Lees of Virginia and the Revolutionary War Governor of Maryland, who bore the same name as he did, was on the maternal side of the family descended from Charles Carroll of Carrollton. Ordained in 1866 after studying at the American College in Rome, Father Lee soon became James Gibbons' successor as secretary to Archbishop Martin J. Spalding and in 1873 was made rector of the cathedral of Baltimore. In 1891 he was assigned to St. Matthew's in Washington, D. C., where his chief work was to build a new church structure on Rhode Island Avenue, since become the cathedral of the new archdiocese. This task was undertaken only after a trip to Europe with his architect, C. Grant LaFarge, to study church designs. Besides serving as pastor with great distinction until his death in 1922, Monsignor Lee was a trustee of the Catholic University of America from 1888 till 1902, and in 1908 he established a scholarship in theology there. His memory, however, will hardly be kept alive by any documentary historian, since it would seem that his only personal papers presently known to be extant are very fragmentary. Two dozen family letters, dating from 1861 to 1867, were recently deposited in the Department of Archives and Manuscripts of the

Catholic University of America by Monsignor Lee's niece and nephew, Miss Sarah R. Lee and Dr. Thomas S. Lee of Washington, D. C., together with some mementoes of the prelate's travels, twenty-five photographs of contemporaries, largely his fellow students in Rome, and a booklet of his sacerdotal jubilee celebration.

The annual Meehan Lectures of the United States Catholic Historical Society of New York were delivered on March 5, 12, and 19 at the Midston House in East 38th Street by Elizabeth M. Lynskey, professor of political science in Hunter College, on the subject "The Government of the Catholic Church."

The recently organized Committee on International Relations of the University of Notre Dame held a symposium on the Soviet Union on February 7-8. Eight speakers, including Michael Karpovich and Franz Dvornik of Harvard, Istvan Kertesz and Vladimir Petrov of Yale, Philip Mosely of Columbia, Naum Jasny of Stanford and Nicholas Timasheff of Fordham, and members of the Notre Dame committee, gave addresses on various aspects of the background, ideology, and reality of Soviet policies.

The University of Notre Dame has announced the formation of a program in Latin American studies to begin in September, 1950. The committee in charge of the program is headed by Thomas T. McAvoy, C.S.C., of the Department of History, as chairman. Other members of the committee are Edmund Smith, assistant dean of the College of Commerce, Thomas E. Downey, Walter Langford, and James Llorens. The program is intended primarily to bring together the classes in the various departments dealing with problems in Latin American history, literature, business, government, and science into a definite scheme for students interested in Latin American studies as such, as well as for those who are interested in careers in business and government in the countries south of the Rio Grande. Some new courses are to be added the first year. Undergraduate degrees in this program will be offered in the Colleges of Arts and Letters and Commerce and graduate degrees in the Departments of History and Modern Languages.

The *ACLS Newsletter* is a recent project of the American Council of Learned Societies. The second number of Volume I, published in October, contains in twenty pages a report by Mortimer Graves on his recent visit to the Near East; one by Philip K. Hitti on the ACLS Near Eastern translation program; and one by Henry M. Silver on the problems of publishing manuscripts by foreign authors. The *Newsletter* appears in offset printing. Communications concerning it should be addressed to Mrs. Sally Hawkins, Editor, 1219 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Department of State Publication 3643 contains selected statements on human rights and genocide. It is available at the U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at the price of 20¢.

In a lengthy note in the January issue of the *Jurist,* Father Jerome Hannan lists various recent expressions of opinion on the matter of Catholic schools and teachers in their relations to the First Amendment.

In the current discussion about the history of church-state relations in the United States very little attention has been paid to the actual beliefs of the men who formulated our tradition. One anachronism, made by debaters on both sides of the controversy, is to interpret the words of the Founding Fathers in meanings those same words have acquired today. Most American historians bring to their study much social, economic, and political information but the American historian who comes prepared in theology and philosophy of that early period is quite rare. Another factor that is not sufficiently weighed is that many of the statements of the day are closely related to the conditions and ideologies of the period of the absolute monarchs of Europe. There is a renewed interest in a study of the ancient ideals of Western civilization, shown particularly in the study of the Great Books and in similar projects, but little careful study has been made of the actual transition by which in some cases distorted and even false notions of that Western tradition were made part of the American cultural tradition.

The existence of a "democratic faith" is something that may well be questioned by critical historians. There has been a tendency among American journalists, and some American historians, to describe a group of fundamental beliefs, mostly unhistorical, to which they would force American youth to subscribe. That there are certain moral principles and certain political principles written into the Constitution and into the legal tradition of the country no one will deny, but the attempt to make this patriotism into a religious faith is at best unhistorical and at the worst very dangerous for American liberties. This has become very much in evidence in the controversy over the separation of church and state in the fields of education. It is an easy step from defining the democratic dogmas to enforcing them by fascistic laws. If American historians want to protect their liberties as well as those of their fellow citizens they should make special efforts to keep the story of American democracy historical. Above all, they must not let American history become the tool of certain pragmatists and relativists who would create an American democratic history after the fashion of the latest findings of the official historians of the Soviet and force it down the throats of American youth in the purest totalitarian fashion.

As part of the celebration of its sesquicentennial anniversary, the Library of Congress, in co-operation with Vanderbilt University, is sponsoring an International Colloquium on Luso-Brazilian Studies which will be held October 4-7 in Washington, D. C. The work of the Colloquium will be divided into five sections, *i.e.,* anthropology, fine arts, literature, history, and instruments of research, and the program for each has been organized by Charles Wagley of Columbia University, Robert C. Smith of the University of Pennsylvania, Edwin B. Williams of the University of Pennsylvania, Alexander Marchant of Vanderbilt University, and Engel Sluiter of the University of California. The officers of the Colloquium are Francis Millet Rogers of Harvard University, chairman; Lewis Hanke of the Library of Congress, secretary; and Manoel S. Cardozo of The Catholic University of America, associate secretary. Those who, through oversight, have not received invitations, and may wish to be kept informed of developments, are asked to write to Dr. Hanke at the Library of Congress.

James F. King, of the University of California, has resigned the editorship of the *Hispanic American Historical Review* and Charles E. Griffin, of the University of Wisconsin, has been elected to fill the vacancy. We take pleasure in congratulating Professor King for having discharged his duties so competently, and we wish his successor a successful term of office.

Volume 12 of the *Handbook of Latin American Studies,* listing important works published on Latin America in 1946 in the fields of anthropology, art, economics, education, cartography, geography, government, history, international relations, language and literature, law, libraries, music, and philosophy, has just been published by the Harvard University Press. The *Handbook* is a project of the Hispanic Foundation of the Library of Congress. The present volume is edited by Francisco Aguilera and Charmion Shelby.

The Commission on History of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History of Mexico City, has published a very useful *Guía de instituciones que cultivan la historia de América* (México, D. F., 1949). Compiled by Carlos Bosch García, the work lists institutions not only in the New World, including Canada and the British and French possessions, but also in Europe. By "América" the Commission means, of course, the Western Hemisphere.

The Second Conference of Western Latin Americanists will be held at Stanford University on May 29 and 30, 1950, and will be devoted this year exclusively to Brazil. The principal Brazilianists in the country have been invited to take part in the discussions, and the Brazilian ambassador to the United States, Dr. Maurício Nabuco, will be among the guests of

honor. Further information will be supplied by Professor Ronald Hilton, Stanford University, Stanford, California.

The tenth anniversary of the establishment of the Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas of Madrid will be celebrated on April 12-17, 1950. Lewis Hanke will represent the Library of Congress and the American Council of Learned Societies at the meetings. The Consejo, during the short period of its existence, has achieved a remarkable productivity and a very creditable level of scholarship in its published works. It deserves to be congratulated for its accomplishment.

Eric Axelson, of the University of Witwatersrand, has been in Portugal for the purpose of microfilming materials in Portuguese archives of interest for the history of the Union of South Africa. Mr. Axelson is the author of a study on the Portuguese period of South African history.

The *Round Table of Franciscan Research* has reprinted its volumes 9 and 10: The Crisis and the Triumph of the Capuchin Reform.

The sixth summer course of the National Archives in the preservation and administration of archives is scheduled for June 12-July 7, 1950. The enrollment is limited to twenty students, and application should be made to Professor Ernst Posner, 1901 F Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. The tuition fee for the course will be $40.00.

The first number of *Archives* published by the British Records Association has made its appearance. It will be published twice yearly at a subscription rate of *7s.6d.* for members of the association and *10s.* for nonmembers.

Among the summaries of theses published in the November issue of the *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* the M.A. thesis of E. L. C. Mullins concerns the "Effects of the Marian and Elizabethan Religious Settlements upon the Clergy of London, 1553-1564" and that of A. A. Conway concerns "New Orleans as a Port of Immigration, 1820-1860."

Librairie Plon, Paris, has just published as Volume III of the Bibliothèque spirituelle du chrétien lettré a group of French translations entitled *Les Pères du désert.* Along with an introduction of nearly sixty pages Professor René Draguet of the University of Louvain presents selected texts concerning the Desert Fathers. The lives of Paul of Thebes and of Anthony are given in full; that of Pachomius, and the Lausiac History, Theodoret's *Historia religiosa,* the *Apothegmata,* and Cassian's *Collationes* are represented by carefully chosen extracts. In some cases the translations are freshly done for this volume from critical texts; in others existing

translations have been utilized, sometimes with considerable revising. The editor of this useful series is Abbé Omer Englebert.

Father Philotheus Boehner, O.F.M., devoted fourteen pages in the December issue of *Franciscan Studies* to a paragraph by paragraph correction of the late Maurice de Wulf's treatment of William of Ockham in the third volume of the *Histoire de la philosophie médiévale* (1947). Father Boehner adequately demonstrates the need of serious studies on the theology and philosophy of Ockham.

In the same number of the *Studies* John B. Morall publishes an article on Ockham's political philosophy which seriously disagrees with Georges de Lagarde's synthesis of it as being an over simplification.

On January 19 Carlton J. H. Hayes retired from the faculty of Columbia University after a half century spent on Morningside Heights, seven years as a student and forty-three years as a teacher. Professor Hayes' scholarly works—he has been the author or co-author of over twenty volumes—are too well known to our readers to need listing here. His splendid contributions to the study of modern nationalism, his forceful and vivid lectures, and the genial and generous manner in which he has imparted his richness of learning to others—all attest the enduring character of his influence and the ennobling impression which he has left on those who have come in contact with him. The American Catholic Historical Association had Professor Hayes for its president in 1931, when he delivered at Minneapolis a splendid presidential address on the "Significance of the Reformation in the Light of Contemporary Scholarship," which was published in the January, 1932, issue of this journal. Moreover, the REVIEW was proud to publish other articles of Professor Hayes such as "The Church and Nationalism" in the issue of April, 1942. Anyone who has had the benefit of knowing this distinguished historian can well believe with *Time* in its issue of January 30 that, "For Columbia, history without Carlton Hayes would be a change indeed." Among the many honors which have come to him in his academic life there was the presidency of the American Historical Association in 1945, the first and only time a Catholic has held that office. In 1946 the American Catholic Historical Association conferred upon him the John Gilmary Shea Prize at its annual meeting in New York for the volume of his memoirs as American ambassador in Madrid, *Wartime Mission to Spain* (New York: 1945). It is the wish of the Association, of the editors of the REVIEW, and of all his friends that Professor Hayes may be given many years of pleasant and fruitful retirement and that in his new found leisure he may continue to enrich the minds of all the devotees of Clio by further products from his pen.

The Reverend Arthur J. Riley of the Archdiocese of Boston has been named historian of the supreme council of the Knights of Columbus to prepare a history of the order. The committee on the history of the order is composed of John E. Swift, supreme knight, Joseph F. Lamb, Luke E. Hart and Monsignor Leo M. Finn. The headquarters of the historical committee will be with the supreme council in New Haven.

Professor Arthur P. Whitaker, of the University of Pennsylvania, is now in France on a Fulbright fellowship. He will study the influence of the Enlightenment on Spanish America.

John K. Zeender was promoted to the rank of assistant professor of history in the University of Massachusetts at the beginning of the present semester.

A. Paul Levack, associate professor of Modern European history in Fordham University and first vice-president of the American Catholic Historical Association, was appointed head of the Department of History at Fordham at the beginning of the present semester to succeed Professor Ross J. S. Hoffman.

Edward J. Goodman, presently on the faculty of the Naval Academy at Annapolis, has been appointed assistant professor of European history at Xavier University, Cincinnati, effective as of the end of the current academic year. Mr. Goodman did his doctoral work at Columbia University in modern European history.

An obituary notice on William George Bruce by Edward A. Fitzpatrick appears in the December issue of the *Wisconsin Magazine of History*.

Father Patrick Roddy, O.F.M., of Old Mission, Santa Barbara, who met death in an automobile accident last August 2, though not an historian by profession, was a staunch supporter of historical studies. He took his doctorate in theology at the University of Innsbruck, presenting a dissertation on the teaching of Duns Scotus concerning the sacrament of penance. Though his chief work at the Old Mission was the teaching of dogmatic theology, Father Roddy had charge for some years of its valuable archives and retained a keen interest in them. He was at work on the history of the library of the Old Mission, which dates from 1786. Deeply interested in the cause of Junipero Serra's beatification, he rendered constant assistance to those engaged in promoting it.

The January issue of the REVIEW was too far advanced for us to chronicle the death on January 3 of Richard J. Purcell, professor of history in the Catholic University of America. Professor Purcell was just two weeks and some days beyond his sixty-second birthday when death struck

suddenly from a heart attack. He had been in apparent good health up to about twenty minutes before his death and, in fact, he had attended the annual meeting of the historians in Boston the previous week, where he appeared in the best of health and spirits. Mr. Purcell took his B.A. and M.A. degrees at the University of Minnesota and in 1916, the Ph.D. degree at Yale University. He was awarded the John A. Porter Prize and two years later, the Justin Windsor Prize of the American Historical Association for his volume, *Connecticut in Transition.* From 1916 to 1920 he taught in the College of St. Thomas in St. Paul and lectured at the College of St. Catherine in the same city. In 1920 Professor Purcell came to the Catholic University of America where in nine years he passed rapidly through the various academic ranks and won the full professorship in 1929. In addition to his teaching and his research he filled a number of administrative positions at the University as secretary of the School of Philosophy, 1922-1930, secretary general of the University, 1930-1935, and head of the Department of History, 1931-1939. In 1929 he published his textbook, *The American Nation,* and continued his writing of the 175 sketches which he contributed to the *Dictionary of American Biography.* In 1927 he was awarded a fellowship by the Guggenheim Foundation and spent that academic year in research in the British Isles. Besides numerous articles which he wrote for various journals like *Studies* and the *Catholic Educational Review* he served as president in 1942 of the Middle States Association of History and Social Science Teachers and as historiographer of the American-Irish Historical Society. In 1939 Professor Purcell was awarded the degree of LL.B. by Georgetown University after having completed the course in law, and later he was admitted to the bar of the District of Columbia. During World War II he was on leave of absence from the University to serve with the War Production Board.

Professor Purcell directed the research projects of a very large number of graduate students in the nearly thirty years that he taught in the University. Most of these subjects were in American Catholic history, and a notable series dealt with nativism in the years before the Civil War. He was a stimulating and challenging teacher who had a real gift for arousing the interest of his students. The close personal bond of friendship which grew up between himself and his students was the best evidence of their high regard for him.

Fintan G. Walker, author of *The Catholic Church in the Meeting of Two Frontiers: The Southern Illinois Country, 1763-1793* (Washington, 1935), died suddenly on January 26 at the age of fifty-four. At the time of his death Monsignor Walker was pastor of St. Patrick's Church, Terre Haute, Indiana. His undergraduate work was completed at the University of Notre Dame, his theological studies at St. Meinrad's Seminary,

and his graduate training at the Catholic University of America, where he took the Ph.D. degree in American Church history under the late Monsignor Guilday. He was a life member of the Association and a former member of the Executive Council.

The year 1950 will mark the centennial of four more American sees. On May 31, 1850, the Diocese of Nesqually was erected by Pius IX, the see city being transferred to Seattle on September 11, 1907. On July 19, 1850, three other jurisdictions were created in the Dioceses of St. Paul, Savannah, and Wheeling. St. Paul was raised to the rank of a metropolitan see on May 4, 1888.

Documents:

Marquette's Ordination. Jerome V. Jacobsen (*Mid-America,* Jan.).—Un breve de Alejandro VI y una carta de Isabel la Católica. J. Meseguer Fernández, O.F.M. (*Archivo Ibero-Americano,* July 1949.).—Report on the State of Brazil, 1612. Engel Sluiter (*Hispanic Amer. Histor. Rev.,* Nov.).—Cartas y noticias del V. P. Junípero Serra, O.F.M. Andrés de Palma de Mallorca, O.F.M. Cap. (*Estudios Franciscanos,* Sept.).

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

MISCELLANEOUS

A Defense of Prehistory. G. E. Daniel (*Cambridge Jrn.*, Dec.).
Philosophy and History. A. Robert Caponigri (*Modern Schoolman*, Jan.).
The Significance of Modern Empiricism for History and Economics. Abbott Payson Usher (*Jrn. of Economic Hist.*, Nov.).
History and Sociology: A Plea for Humility. David Spring (*Canadian Histor. Rev.*, Sept.).
The Social Responsibilities of the Historian. Conyers Read (*Amer. Histor. Rev.*, Jan.).
Concepción funcional de la igualdad en algunos textos de León XIII. Federico Rodríquez (*Revista de estudios politicos*, July).
Liberty Revisited. Carlton J. H. Hayes (*New York Hist.*, Jan.).
Theoretical Foundations of World Government. Thomas I. Cook (*Rev. of Politics*, Jan.).
Peace or Armistice in the Near East? Hannah Arendt (*ibid.*).
The Fallacy of Absolute Majority Rule. Herbert McClosky (*Jrn. of Politics*, Nov.).
Doctrinal History and Its Interpretation. Etienne Gilson (*Speculum*, Oct.).
The Scientific Investigation of Mediaeval Canon Law: the Need and the Opportunity. Stephan Kuttner (*ibid.*).
Humanism and the Middle Ages. E. J. McCorkell, C.S.B. (*ibid.*).
Charlemagne. François L. Ganshof (*ibid.*).
Small Gothic Ironwork. Edgar B. Frank (*ibid.*).
Walther von der Vogelweide's Ottonian Poems: A New Interpretation. Arthur Hatto (*ibid.*).
La grotte des manuscrits hebreux. R.P.R. de Vaux (*Revue biblique*, Oct.).
Les manuscrits du désert de Juda. III. Découverte et exploration de la grotte. G. Lambert, S.J. (*Nouvelle revue théologique*, Jan.).
The Collection for the Saints. Charles H. Buck, Jr. (*Harvard Theolog. Rev.*, Jan.).
Paul of Constantinople. W. Telfer (*ibid.*).
La seconde génération chrétienne. M. Goguel (*Revue de l'histoire des religions*, July).
Exploration beneath St. Peter's. F. X. Murphy (*Thought*, Dec.).
Les catacombes romaines. Emmanuel Bourque (*La revue de l'Université Laval*, Dec.).
Das Stundengebet des Laien im christlichen Altertum. J. Stadlhuber (*Zeitschrift fuer katholische Theologie*, Vol. 71, no. 2, 1949).
Attività della Pontificia Commissione di Archeologia Sacra. A. Ferrua (*Revista di archeologia christiana*, Vol. 25, no. 1-4, 1949).
Materia e spirito nella plastica paleocristiana. L. De Bruyne (*ibid.*).
Das vierte Makkabaeerbuch, Ignatius von Antiochien und die aeltesten Martyrerberichte. O. Perler (*ibid.*).
La vite negli antichi monumenti cristiani di Napoli e della Campania. D. Mallardo (*ibid.*).
L'iconographie des catacombes et la cathéchèse antique. A. G. Martimort (*ibid.*)
Les chapelles triconques paléochrétiennes de la Trinité de Lérins et de la Gayolle. F. Benoît (*ibid.*).
«Orientierung» im Weltbild der ersten christlichen Jahrhunderte. L. Voelkl (*ibid.*).
The Eucharistic Lectionary. Massey H. Shepherd, Jr. (*Anglican Theolg. Rev.*, Jan.).
The Use of *Ecclesia* in the Apostolic Fathers. Stephen C. Walke (*ibid.*).
". . . Ab his qui sunt undique . . ." Irénée, Adv. her., III. P. Galtier (*Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, Vol. XLIV, Nos. 3-4).

L'homélie de "Méliton" sur la Passion. P. Nautin (*ibid.*).
Le texte du Gloria in excelsis. B. Capelle (*ibid.*).
La grande pitié des églises de Dalmatie dans les dernières années du VI^e^. S. J. Zeiller (*ibid.*).
Abbon de Fleury, Hériger de Lobbes et Gerland de Besançon sur l'ère de l'Incarnation de Denys le Petit. A. Cordoliani (*ibid.*).
Urschrift ou remaniement? "L'Imitation" de Lubeck. P. Debongnie (*ibid.*).
Touchant la date du commentaire sur le psautier de Théodoret de Cyr. M. Brok (*ibid.*).
Documents pour l'histoire des chanoines réguliers. J. Leclercq (*ibid.*).
La composition et l'esprit du *De anima* de Tertullien. A.-J. Festugière (*Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, Apr., 1949).
Intérêt historique d'une étude de la gnose chrétienne. M.-M. Sagnard (*ibid.*).
Hugues de S. Cher et la condamnation de 1241. H.-F. Dondaine (*ibid.*).
Le sacerdoce royal des chrétiens selon saint Hilaire de Poitiers. J. Lécuyer (*L'année théologique*, fasc. 4, 1949).
L'Eglise catholique. Moyen âge et temps modernes. Perspectives d'avenir. G. Bardy (*ibid.*).
L'affaire Nestorius vue de Rome. E. Amann (*Revue des sciences religieuses*, Jan., 1949).
Copies et éditions au V^e^ siècle. G. Bardy (*ibid.*).
Le sacerdoce chrétien et le sacrifice eucharistique selon Théodore de Mopsueste. Joseph Lécuyer (*Recherches de science religieuse*, Oct.).
La seconde Partie de l'In Joannem de saint Augustin et la date du commentaire. Maurice Le Landais (*ibid.*).
«Sens spirituel». Henri de Lubac (*ibid.*).
La Aeltoupyia des Prophètes et des Didascales à Antioche. Erik Peterson (*ibid.*).
A propos du Signe du Temple. Un Texte de Clément d'Alexandrie. Claude Mondésert (*ibid.*).
Précisions sur la date de la Curatio de Théodoret de Cyr. Pierre Canivet (*ibid.*).
Pour l'interprétation des Quinque Viae de saint Thomas d'Aquin. Maurice Bouyges (*ibid.*).
Origène et saint Thomas d'Aquin. Henri de Lubac (*ibid.*).
Commodien [Inst. I. II, c. 17, v. 19]. Prosper Schepens (*ibid.*).
Hieronymus und die jüngeren griechischen Uebersetzungen des alten Testaments. Martin Johannessohn (*Theologische Literaturzeitung*, Mar., 1948).
Neue Wege der Hagiographie. Ernst Benz (*ibid.*, June, 1948).
Schriften zur Geschichtslogik und zur Geschichtstheologie, I and II. Karl Heussi (*ibid.*, May and July, 1948).
Les états de texte des homélies pseudo-basiliennes sur la création de l'homme. D. Amand (*Revue bénédictine*, Vol. LIX, Nos. 1-4, 1949).
Sermons inédits de saint Augustin pour les fêtes de saints. C. Lambot (*ibid.*).
Augustinus und Athanasius. B. Altaner (*ibid.*).
Fragments des lettres XCIIA et CLXXIIIA d'Augustin dans le ms. Paris B. N. lat. 11641. C. Charlier (*ibid.*).
Sermons de l'école de saint Augustin. J. Leclercq (*ibid.*).
Deux sermons restitués à saint Pierre Chrysologue. A. Olivar (*ibid.*).
Les prologue du «Liber scintillarum». H.-M. Rochais (*ibid.*).
Bref discours pastoral attribuable à Paulin d'Aquilée. J. Leclercq (*ibid.*).
Saint-Ruf et ses coutumes aux XI^e^ et XII^e^ siècles. Ch. Dereine (*ibid.*).
Saint Bernard et Origène d'après un manuscrit de Madrid. J. Leclercq (*ibid.*).
Sermon ancien sur les danses déshonnêtes. J. Leclercq (*ibid.*).
Sur la date de la visite de Totila à saint Benoît. A. Mundo (*ibid.*).
Les dates de l'abbatiat et de la mort d'Ambroise Autpert. J. Winandy (*ibid.*).
Les raisons causales, d'après saint Augustin. René Capdet (*Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique*, Oct.).
A Note on the Frequency of Mass in Sixth-Century France. Henry G. J. Beck (*American Eccles. Rev.*, June).

El «Liber de Variis Quaestionibus» no es de Félix de Urgel. Angel Custodio Vega (*La ciudad de Dios*, May, 1949).
La metafísica de Egidio Romano a la luz de las 24 tesis tomistas. P. Gregorio Suárez (*ibid.*).
Les définitions des sacraments pendant la première periode de la théologie scolastique (1050-1235). P. Damianus Van den Eynde, O.F.M. (*Antonianum*, Oct.).
La «Reductio Artium ad Sacram Scripturam», quale espressione dell'umanesimo medievale fino al secolo XII. Franco Simone (*Convivium*, No. 6, 1949).
Un codice poco noto della "Vita scholastica" di Bonvesin da la Riva. Giovanni Cremaschi (*Aevum*, July, 1949).
Corrientes filosóficas en el siglo XIII. F. Van Steenberghen (*Sapientia*, Oct.).
Un codice importante en la catedral de Siguenza. [Albertus Magnus, Commentary on the Sentences.] A. Federico Fernandez (*Revista de archivos bibliotecas y museos*, Sept., 1948).
La protection des étudiants à l'Université de Paris au XIII[e] siècle. A. L. Gabriel (*Rev. de l'Université d'Ottawa*, Jan.).
Boniface VIII et le jubilé de 1300. Joseph Lecler (*Etudes*, Feb.).
Ockham's Political Philosophy. John B. Morall (*Franciscan Studies*, Dec.).
Nominalismus. Erich Hochstetter (*ibid.*).
Ockham and Aegidius of Rome. Ernest A. Moody (*ibid.*).
A Recent Presentation of Ockham's Philosophy. Philotheus Boehner, O.F.M. (*ibid.*).
Pivotal Concepts in the Political Philosophy of William of Ockham. Charles C. Bayley (*Jrn. of the Hist. of Ideas*, Apr., 1949).
"People's Courts" in the Middle Ages. Robert I. Burns (*Histor. Bulletin*, Jan.).
Zur Problematik der kirchlichen Misstände im Spaetmittelalter. Joseph Lortz (*Trierer theologische Zeitschrift*, Sept. and Nov.).
Learning at the Court of Charles IV. S. Harrison Thompson (*Speculum*, Jan.).
The Ass and the Harp. Helen Adolf (*ibid.*).
The Arabic Sources for the Life of Saladin. H. A. R. Gibb (*ibid.*).
An Esslingen Binder of the Late Gothis Period. Ernst Kyriss (*ibid.*).
Dante's Allegory. Charles S. Singleton (*ibid.*).
The Text of Augustine's *De Genesi ad Litteram*. John H. Taylor, S.J. (*ibid.*).
Mediaeval Interest in Intellectual History. Lynn Thorndike (*ibid.*).
The Arthurian Tradition in Lambert d'Ardes. Urban T. Holmes, Jr. (*ibid.*).
Historical Novels (1948-1949). B. J. Whiting (*ibid.*).
Mehmed's II. fruehester Staatsvertrag (1446). F. Babinger-F. Dölger (*Orientalis christiana periodica*, Vol. XV, Nos. 3-4, 1949).
L'Anaphore chaldéenne des apôtres. B. Botte, O.S.B. (*ibid.*).
Acht Briefe des Kardinals Bessarion. G. Hofmann, S.J. (*ibid.*).
Complimenti a notizie sull'unione di orientali con Roma. A Mercati (*ibid.*).
Zum Problem der Epiklese anlaesslich der Veröffentlichung eines russischen Theologen. B. Schultz, S.J. (*ibid.*).
Bogomilisme et néo-manichéisme: après le livre de Dm. Obolensky (1948). F. Tailliez, S.J. (*ibid.*).
Briefwechsel zwischen Gabriel Severos und Anton Possevino S. I. G. Hofmann, S.J. (*ibid.*).
St. Seraphin of Montegranaro. Hilary Zach (*Round Table of Franciscan Research*, Jan.).
Fr. George of Geel—1617-52. Armand Dasseville (*ibid.*).
Three Capuchin Vicar-Generals—1593-1602. Capistran Ferrito (*ibid.*).
Francis and Mary. John Baptist Kurcz (*ibid.*).
O conceito e a funcão do imperium em Francisco Suárez. Albin Eduard Beau (Boletim da Faculdade de Direito da Universidade de Coimbra, Vol. XXV, 1949).
Ideas políticas de Sor María de Agreda. Antonio González, O.P. (*Unitas*, Oct.).
The Church and the Jews. George La Piana (*Historia Judaica*, Oct., 1949).
The Jerusalem Bishopric, 1841. R. W. Greaves (*English Histor. Rev.*, July).

The Communist Attack on the Catholic and Orthodox Churches in Rumania. Ion Ratiu (*Eastern Churches Quart.*, July).
The Assumption of Our Lady in the Oriental Liturgies II. Archdale A. King (*ibid.*, July and Oct.).
Orthodox and Catholics in Syria and the Lebanon. George Khodre (*ibid.*, Oct.).
Scholae puerorum: sua história e organizacão. Guilherme Schubert (*Revista eclesiástica brasileira*, Dec.).
The Catholic Church Works with UNESCO. Wendelin Moore, C.P. (*Sign*, Jan.).

EUROPEAN

Les premières «paroisses» de la Gaule. E. Griffe (*Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique*, Oct.).
Observations sur la chronologie des Chartes de Cluny. Chanoine M. Chaume (*Revue Mabillon*, Oct.).
L'abbaye et l'ordre de Cluny à la fin du XVIII[e] siècle (1757-1790). Dom G. Charvin (*ibid.*).
Les papiers de Quesnel saisis à Bruxelles et transportés à Paris en 1703 et 1704. L. Ceyssens (*Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, Vol. XLIV, Nos. 3-4.).
Les conflits juridictionnels et bénéficiaux entre l'Université de Louvain et l'évêque de Liège de 1425 à 1568. M. Bruwier (*ibid.*).
An Irish Priest in France. Gerard O'Beirne (*Studies*, Dec., 1949).
American Metropolitan Press Reaction to the Paris Commune of 1871. George L. Cherry (*Mid-America*, Jan.).
The Archivio Bentivoglio at Ferrara. Cecilia M. Ady (*English Histor. Rev.*, July, 1949).
Pio IX e la restaurazione del 1849-50. Paolo dalla Torre (*Aevum*, July, 1949).
The Liberal Experiment and the Italian Revolution of 1848—A Revaluation. A. William Salomone (*Jrn. of Central European Affairs*, Oct., 1949).
The Polish-Soviet Exchange of Population. Joseph B. Schechtman (*ibid.*).
Austrian and German Universities in 1948. Arthur J. May (*ibid.*).
A posse de ano e dia no direito hispânico medieval. Guilherme Braga da Cruz (*Boletim da Faculdade de Direito da Universidade de Coimbra*, Fasc. 1, Vol. XXV, 1949).
Los Pirineos según los principales autores árabes de la edad media. Jacinto Bosch Vilá (*Pirineos*, Jan., 1949).
Legislación medieval en un valle pirenaico. Las "Ordinacions de la Vila d'Ager" en el año 1278. I. de C. Serra-Rafols (*ibid.*).
La construcción de la colegiata de Alquézar (Notas documentales). Antonio Ubieto Arteta (*ibid.*)
Lourdes (Estudio geográfico). Pierre Laserre (*ibid.*).
Origen de la marina real de Castilla. Julio González (*Revista de archivos bibliotecas y museos*, May, 1948).
Bibliotecas, libreros e impresores madrileños del siglo XVII. Marqués del Saltillo (*ibid.*).
Ampurias: sus murallas: aparejos y cronología. Octavio Gil y Farrés (*ibid.*)
El «tesorillo de las Alcantarillas» del Museo Arqueológico Hispalense. Concepción Fernández-Chicarro (*ibid.*).
Notas sobre el Consejo de Italia y la Sección «Secretarias Provinciales» del Archivo General de Simancas. Felipe Ruiz Martín (*ibid.*).
Una polémica en 1805 sobre los límites de la Luisiana (La misión en España de Jaime Monroe). Jaime Delgado (*ibid.*, Sept., 1948.).
La biblioteca del monasterio de Santo Domingo de Silos. Florentino Pérez (*ibid.*).
Los cuestores en España y la regalía de indulgencias. José Goñi Gaztambide (*Hispania sacra*, Jan., 1949).
Textes et manuscrits de quelques bibliothèques d'Espagne. Jean Leclercq, O.S.B. (*ibid.*).

Calendarios hispánicos anteriores al siglo XII. José Vives y Angel Fábrega (*ibid.*).
Un nouvel homiliaire en écriture wisigothique. Louis Brou, O.S.B. (*ibid.*).
El Archivo de la Santa Cruzada. José Goñi Gaztambide (*ibid.*).
Inventario de manuscritos de la Biblioteca universitaria de Barcelona referentes a ordenes religiosas. Francisco Miquel Rosell (*ibid.*).
Manuscritos españoles de bibliotecas extranjeras. La «Biblioteca Nazionale», de Roma. José Rius Serra (*ibid.*).
Guicciardini en la Corte del Rey Católico. Carlos M. Alvarez-Peña (*Universidad*, Jan., 1949).
Influencia diplomática y económica de España en Tierra Santa. Francisco Quecedo, O.F.M. (*Hispania*, Jan., 1949).
La espulsión de los judios del reino le Nápoles (*cont.*). Felipe Ruiz Martin (*ibid.*).
Un discipulo de P. Maestro Avila en la Inquisición de Córdoba. El Dr. Diego Pérez de Valdivia, catedrático de Baeza. Juan Manuel Sánchez Gómez (*ibid.*).
Juan de Herrera y el aposento de Felipe II en Torrelodones. Luis Cervera Vera (*La ciudad de Dios*, May, 1949).
Génesis del movimiento misional en las provincias capuchinas de España (1618-1650). Melchoir de Pobladura, O.F.M. Cap. (*Estudios Franciscanos*, Sept., 1949).
Despertar misionero en la Orden Franciscana en la época de los descubrimientos (1493-1530). Lázaro de Aspurz, O.F.M. Cap. (*ibid.*).
En torno a San Lorenzo de Brindis. Gabriel de Sotiello, O.F.M. Cap. (*ibid.*).
Unos retablos de Bautista Palma, pintor genovés, de los conventos capuchinos de Olot, Lérida y Blanes. José M.ª Madurell (*ibid.*).
Mons. Ketteler, orientador del movimiento social de su época. Joaquin Civera Y Sormani (*ibid.*).
Síntesis y sectarismo en el 18 de Julio. Gaspar Gómez de la Serna (*Revista de estudios políticos*, July).
Evolution des états satellites. Roger de Craon-Poussy (*La revue de l'Université Laval*, Dec.).
The Crisis in the Polish Communist Party. Adam B. Ulam (*Rev. of Politics*, Jan.).
Belgian Political Parties since Liberation. F. E. Oppenheim (*ibid.*).
Iranische Herkunft des kroatischen Volksnamens. S. Sakač, S.J. (*Orientalia christiana periodica*, Vol. XV, n. 3-4, 1949).
Moralistes de Russie. S. Tyszkiewicz, S.J. (*ibid.*).
Palmerston versus Russian Imperialism, 1852-1856. Sister M. Charlita (*Histor. Bulletin*, Jan.).
Dostoievsky, prophète du monde contemporain. Jacques Gouis (*Rev. de l'Université d'Ottawa*, Jan.).
L'eglise catholique et la Russie. Philippe de Régis, S.J. (*Nouvelle revue théologique*, Jan.).
Recent Developments in Soviet Public Administration. Merle Fainsod (*Jrn. of Politics*, Nov.).

BRITISH EMPIRE

The Anglo-Norman Franchises. Part I. Naomi D. Hurnard (*English Histor. Rev.*, July).
The Disputed Election of Hugh Balsham, Bishop of Ely. Walter Ullmann (*Cambridge Histor. Jrn.*, Vol. 9, No. 3, 1949).
Materials for the Study of Edward III's Credit Operations, 1327-1348. Part I. E. B. Fryde (*Bulletin of the Inst. of Histor. Research*, Nov.).
Two early collections of the Becker Correspondence and of Other Contemporary Documents. A. Saltman (*ibid.*).
The 'Political Revolution' of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries in England. B. Wilkinson (*Speculum*, Oct.).

Royal Taxation and the Growth of the Realm in Mediaeval England. Robert S. Hoyt (*Speculum*, Jan.).
Phases of Grosseteste's Intellectual Life. Josiah C. Russell (*Harvard Theolog. Rev.*, Jan.).
Recent Trends in Economic History. Sir Frederick Rees (*Hist.*, Feb., 1949).
The Provision of Vicars in the Early Fourteenth Century. Miss V. F. M. Garlick (*ibid.*).
Henry VIII and the Anglican Revolt. Thomas L. Coonan (*Histor. Bulletin*, Jan.).
Henry of London, Archbishop of Dublin. Aubrey Gwynn (*Studies*, Dec.).
The Gaelic Union: A Nonagenarian Retrospect. P. Canon Power (*ibid.*).
Departments of Education: Church and State. Joseph O'Neill (*ibid.*).
Historic Galway Convents. Helena Concannon (*ibid.*).
Tercentenary of Owen Roe O'Neill. G. A. Hayes-McCoy (*ibid.*).
Newman, curé anglican, 1828-1843. Francis Hermans (*Nouvelle revue théologique*, Nov., 1949).

AMERICAN

The Impact of Immigration upon New York, 1840-60. Richard H. Leach (*New York Hist.*, Jan.).
The Church of England as the Established Church in Seventeenth-Century Virginia. William H. Seiler (*Jrn. of Southern Hist.*, Nov.).
The Churches in Georgia during the Civil War. T. Conn Bryan (*Georgia Histor. Quart.*, Dec.).
Communia, Iowa. A Nineteenth-Century German-American Utopia. George Schulz-Bebrend (*Iowa Jrn. of Hist.*, Jan.).
History and Folklore. Philip D. Jordan (*Missouri Histor. Rev.*, Jan.).
The Significance of State and Local History. Clifford L. Lord (*ibid.*).
Bishop John Lancaster Spalding and the Catholic Minority (1877-1908). Thomas T. McAvoy, C.S.C. (*Rev. of Politics*, Jan.).
The Cowboy and Religion. Clifford J. Westermeiser (*Histor. Bulletin*, Jan.).
When Our West Moved North. Paul F. Sharp (*Amer. Histor. Rev.*, Jan.).
Bishop Oxnam vs. Catholics. Frederick J. Zwierlein (*Social Justice Rev.*, Jan.).
The Quebec Ship Labourers' Benevolent Society. J. I. Cooper (*Canadian Histor. Rev.*, Dec.).
Lamartine et l'Institut Canadien de Montréal. Séraphin Marion (*Rev. de l'Université d'Ottawa*, Jan.).
Paul Le Jeune and His Company. James Brodrick (*Month*, Dec., 1949).
Labor and the Church in Quebec. Blair Fraser (*Foreign Affairs*, Jan.).
The Preservation of the Documentation on the History of the Americas. Luther H. Evans (*Library of Congress Quart. Jrn. of Current Acquisitions*, Nov.).
The Church in Arizona. John Baptist Salpointe. (*Records of the Amer. Cath. Histor. Soc. of Phila.*, Dec.).
The New World at the Beginning of the XVII Century. Umberto Renigni (*ibid.*).
Vasco de Quiroga: Oidor Made Bishop. Paul S. Lietz (*Mid-America*, Jan.).
Brother Boruhradsky, Alias de Castro. Joseph Roubik (*ibid.*).
The Bishop of Utopia [Don Vasco de Quiroga]. John W. Meaney (*Records of the Amer. Cath. Histor. Soc. of Phila.*, Dec.).
Mescalero Apache History in the Southwest. Morris E. and Catherine H. Opler (*New Mexico Histor. Rev.*, Jan.).
Frederick E. Phelps: a Soldier's Memoirs. Frank D. Reeve, Ed. (*ibid.*).
The Coming of the Augustinians to the New World. Carlos E. Castañeda (*Records of the Amer. Cath. Histor. Soc. of Phila.*, Dec.).
The California Catholic Church, 1840-1849: A Report on Religion. John B. McGloin, S.J. (*ibid.*).
Relations of General Scott with Santa Anna. Carlos E. Casteñeda (*Hispanic Amer. Histor. Rev.*, Nov.).

Padre António Vieira, S.J., and the Institution of the Brazil Company in 1649. C. R. Boxer (*ibid.*).

Tithe Collection in the Bishopric of Oaxaca, 1601-1867. Woodrow Borah (*ibid.*).

The Irish and Others in Argentina. John Murray (*Studies*, Dec., 1949).

Antonio Lelio de Fermo y la condenación del «De Indiarum iure» de Solórzano Pereyra. Pedro de Leturia (*Hispania sacra*, Jan., 1949).

El fundador de Pamplona. Juan Manuel Pacheco (*Revista Javeriana*, Nov.).

Capitulo de abastos en la historia americana. Constantino Bayle, S.J. (*Razón y fe*, Nov.).

La estraña historia de la recopilación de Antonio de León Pinelo. I. Rafael Altamira (*Boletim da Faculdade de Direito da Universidade de Coimbra*, Fasc. 1, Vol. XXV, 1949).

La influencia franciscana en el folklore nuevomexicano. Enrique C. de la Casa (*Revista hispánica moderna*, Jan., 1947).

BOOKS RECEIVED

Austin, Aleine. *The Labor Story. A Popular History of American Labor.* (New York: Coward-McCann, Inc., 1949. Pp. x, 244. $2.50.)

Bayley, Charles C. *The Formation of the German College of Electors in the Mid-Thirteenth Century.* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1949. Pp. 237. $4.00.)

Benno, F. Lee. *European History since 1870.* 3rd ed. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1950. Pp. xx, 946, 99. $5.50.)

Berlau, A. Joseph. *The German Social Democratic Party, 1914-1921.* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1949. Pp. 374. $4.75.)

Berry, Thomas, C.P. *The Historical Theory of Giambattista Vico.* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1949. Pp. x, 165. $1.75.)

Bestor, Arthur Eugene, Jr. *Backwoods Utopias.* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1950. Pp. xi, 288. $4.00.)

Bolton, Herbert Eugene. *Coronado. Knight of Pueblos and Plains.* (New York: Whittlesey House, 1949. Pp. xii, 491. $6.00.)

Bolton, Herbert Eugene. *Coronado on the Turquoise Trail.* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1949. Pp. xvi, 491. $8.00.)

Bone, Hugh A. *American Politics and the Party System.* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1949. Pp. viii, 777. $5.50.)

Bourret, F. M. *The Gold Coast. A Survey of the Gold Coast and British Togoland, 1919-1946.* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1949. Pp. xi, 231. $4.00.)

Bradford, S. C. *Documentation.* (Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1950. Pp. 156. $3.00.)

Buffalo Centennial Eucharistic Congress Historical Committee (Ed.). *Buffalo Centennial Eucharistic Congress.* (Buffalo: Union and Echo, 1948. Pp. 318.)

Burton, Katherine. *The Great Mantle: The Life of Giuseppe Melchiore Sarto, Pope Pius X.* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., Inc., 1950. Pp. xiv, 238. $3.00.)

Buschbeck, E. H. *Austria.* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1949. Pp. xi, 251. $2.50.)

Campbell, William E. *Erasmus, Tyndale and More.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1949. Pp. xi, 288. $5.00.)

Catholic Church in Melbourne: 1848-1948. (Melbourne: Advocate Press, 1948. Pp. 109.)

Clark, Andrew Hill. *The Invasion of New Zealand by People, Plants and Animals.* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1949. Pp. xiv, 465. $6.00.)

Coleman, J. Winston, Jr. *A Bibliography of Kentucky History.* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1949. Pp. xvi; 516. $10.00.)

Colleran, Joseph M., C.SS.R. (Trans.). *St. Augustine: The Greatness of the Soul. The Teacher.* (Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1950. Pp. 255. $3.00.)

Commager, Henry Steele. *Documents of American History.* (New York: Appleton- Century-Crofts, Inc., 1949. Pp. xxiii, 759. $5.00.) Fifth edition.

Corner, George W. (Ed.). *The Autobiography of Benjamin Rush.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949. Pp. 399. $5.00.)

Coulter, E. Merton. *The Confederate States of America, 1861-1865.* Volume 7 of *A History of the South.* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1950. Pp. x, 644. $7.00.)

Dale, Edward Everett. *The Indians of the Southwest.* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1949. Pp. xvi, 283. $4.00.)

Dawson, R. MacGregor. *Democratic Government in Canada.* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1950. Pp. 188. $2.75.)

Department of State. *International Organizations in Which the United States Participates.* (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1950. Pp. viii, 335. 65¢.)

Dickson, Harold E. *John Wesley Jarvis. American Painter, 1780-1840.* (New York: New York Historical Society, 1949. Pp. xx, 476. $10.00.)

Dole, Eugene Edgar. (Ed.). *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society.* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1949. Pp. 113. $1.75.)

Donnelly, James S. *The Decline of the Medieval Cistercian Lay-brotherhood.* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1949. Pp. viii, 95.)

Dubos, Rene J. *Louis Pasteur. Free Lance of Science.* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1950. Pp. xii, 418. $5.00.)

Duffey, Felix D., C.S.C. *Psychiatry and Ascetism.* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1950. Pp. 132. $2.00.)

Earle, Edward Meade. (Ed.). *Nationalism and Internationalism. Essays Inscribed to Carlton J. H. Hayes.* (New York: Columbia Uniersity Press, 1950. Pp. xvii, 510. $5.75.)

Eaton, Evelyn and Edward Roberts Moore. *Heart in Pilgrimage* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1948. Pp. 273. $2.75.)

Ferm, Vergilius. (Ed.). *Forgotten Religions. A Symposium.* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1950. Pp. xv, 392. $7.50.)

Fleming, Walter L. *Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama.* (New York: Peter Smith, 1949. Pp. xiii, 815. $10.00.) A micro-offset book.

Fox, William Sherwood. *St. Ignace. Canadian Altar of Martyrdom.* (Toronto: McClelland & Steward Ltd., 1949. Pp. xvi, 173. $3.00.)

Gantenbein, James W. (Comp. and Ed.). *The Evolution of Our Latin-American Policy.* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1950. Pp. xxvii, 979. $12.50.)

García, Carlos Bosch. (Ed.). *Guia de instituciones que cultivan la historia de america.* (Mexico: Instituto Panamericano de Geografía E. Historia, 1949. Pp. 231.)

Gay, Françisque. *Canada: XX^e Siècle.* (Paris: Bloud & Gay, 1949. Pp. xii, 205. 250 fr.)

Ginger, Ray. *The Bending Cross. A Biography of Eugene Victor Debs.* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1949. Pp. x, 516. $5.00.)

Gough, John Francis. *The Last Days of Antoine Charles du Houx. Baron de Vioménil. Lieutenant General of the Armies of the King, Second in Command under Rochambeau.* (2672 Boulevard, Jersey City 6, 1950. Pp. 57. $2.00.) This booklet treats of the career of one of the French officers who lost his life in August, 1792, in defending the Tuileries. Twelve pages of notes accompany the text. Copies can be secured from the author at the address given above.

Graham, John Jr. (Ed.). *Letters of Thomas Carlyle to William Graham.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950. Pp. xx, 86. $2.50.)

Halévy, Elie. *The Liberal Awakening, 1815-1830.* Volume II of *A History of the English People in the Nineteenth Century.* Translated from the French by E. I. Watkin. (New York: Peter Smith, 1949. Pp. xv, 325. $6.00.) This is a reprint of a volume which appeared originally in French in 1923 and in an English translation in 1926.

Haney, Lewis H. *History of Economic Thought.* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1949. Pp. xxii, 996. $5.00.) This is the fourth and enlarged edition of a work which originally appeared in 1911. The author is professor of economics in New York University.

Hanke, Lewis. *Bartolomé de las Casas.* (Habana: Sociedad Económica de Amigos del Pais, 1949. Pp. xlv, 126.)

Herlihy, Francis. *Now Welcome Summer.* (Dublin: Clonmore & Reynolds Ltd., 1948. Pp. 255.)

Hufford, Harold E. and Watson G. Caudill (Comps.). *Preliminary Inventory of the Records of the United States Senate.* (Washington: National Archives, 1950. Pp. 284.)

Hunter, Louis C. *Steamboats on the Western Rivers.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949. Pp. xiii, 684. $10.00.)

Jenks, William Alexander. *The Austrian Electoral Reform of 1907.* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1950. Pp. 227. $3.25.)

Judson, Margaret Atwood. *The Crisis of the Constitution. An Essay in Constitutional and Political Thought in England, 1603-1645.* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1949. Pp. xi, 444. $5.00.)

Kamp, Joseph P. *We Must Abolish the United States.* (New York: Constitutional Educational League, Inc., 1950. Pp. x, 168. $1.00.)

Klein, Félix. *La route du Petit Morvandiau.* Vol. V. *Sans arrêt.* (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1949. Pp. 346.

Lamprecht, Sterling P. *Nature and History.* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1950. Pp. xii, 155. $2.50.)

Le Boutillier, Cornelia Geer. *American Democracy and Natural Law.* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1950. Pp. vi, 204. $3.00.)

Lenn, Lottie H. and Mary A. Reardon. *Pope Pius XII. Rock of Peace.* (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1950. Pp. 152. $2.50.)

Leonard, Irving A. *Books of the Brave.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949. Pp. xiii, 381. $5.00.)

Leonard, Irving A. *Hispanic America and Science.* (Coral Gables: University of Miami Press, 1949. Pp. 23.) This is number eight of the University of Miami Hispanic-American Studies edited by J. Riis Owre.

Leturis, Pedro, S.J. *Inigo de Loyola.* Translated by Aloysius J. Owen, S.J. (Syracuse: Le Moyne College Press, 1949. Pp. xiii, 209. $4.50.)

Manning, Thomas G., David M. Potter and Wallace E. Davies. *Government and American Economy. 1870-Present.* (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1950. Pp. xvi, 464. $3.25.)

Melbourne Catholic Centenary 1948. In Pictures. (Melbourne: Advocate Press, 1948. Pp. 23. 2'6.)

Miscellanea Pio Paschini: Studi di storia ecclesiastica. Vol. I and II. (Rome: Facultas Theologica Pontificii Athenaei Lateranensis, 1949. Pp. xxii, 500; 451.)

Murphy, Frank. *Daniel Mannix, Archbishop of Melbourne.* (Melbourne: Advocate Press, 1948. Pp. 258. 15/-net.)

McGloin, John Bernard, S.J. *Eloquent Indian. The Life of James Bouchard, California Jesuit.* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1949. Pp. xvii, 380. $5.00.)

Nelson, Benjamin N. *The Idea of Usury.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950. Pp. xxi, 258. $3.00.)

Norris, Herbert. *Church Vestments. Their Origin and Development.* (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1950. Pp. xv, 190. $12.00.)

Orton, William A. *The Economic Role of the State.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950. Pp. x, 192. $3.00.)

Péguy, Charles. *The Mystery of the Charity of Joan of Arc.* Translated by Julian Green. (New York: Pantheon Books, Inc., 1950. Pp. 216. $3.00.): This volume marks the complete translation in English for the first time of a book of Péguy. It is written in the form of a miracle play and represents the final effort of a work on which the poet labored for more than fifteen years.

Petrie, Sir Charles. *The Jacobite Movement: The First Phase, 1688-1716.* (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1948; New York: Macmillan, 1949. Pp. xii, 240. $3.50.)

Pope St. Gregory the Great. *Life and Miracles of St. Benedict (Book Two of the Dialogues).* Translated by Odo J. Zimmermann, O.S.B., and Benedict R. Avery, O.S.B. (Collegeville: St. John's Abbey Press, 1949. Pp. xv, 87. $2.00, cloth; 90¢, paper.) This little volume contains a competent translation of St. Gregory's second book of *Dialogues* and is accompanied by a bibliography, notes, and an index.

Powell, J. H. *Bring Out Your Dead.* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1949. Pp. xi, 304. $3.75.)

Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society at the Semi-annual Meeting Held in Boston, April 20, 1949. (Worcester: American Antiquarian Society, 1949. Pp. 160. $1.00.)

Proceedings of the Ninety-Fourth Convention of Catholic Central Verein of America and the Thirty-Third Convention of National Catholic Women's Union. Held at San Francisco, Calif., August 6 to 10, 1949. (St. Louis: Central Bureau Press, 1949.)

Reynolds, Edward D., S.J. *Jesuits for the Negro.* (New York: America Press, 1949. Pp. v, 232. $2.50.)

Roberts, Chalmers M. *Washington Past and Present.* (Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1950. Pp. 218. $4.50.)

Roemer, Theodore, O.F.M. Cap. *The Catholic Church in the United States.* St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1950. Pp. viii, 444. $5.00.)

Rowan, John Patrick. *The Soul.* A Translation of St. Thomas Aquinas' *De Anima.* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1949. Pp. viii, 291. $4.00.)

Rutledge, Anna Wells. *Artists in the Life of Charleston.* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1949. Pp. 159. $3.00 with illustrated cover; $2.50 with regular Transactions cover.)

Schiavo, Giovanni. *Italian-American History.* Vol. II. *The Italian Contribution to the Catholic Church in America.* (New York: Vigo Press, 1949. Pp. viii, 1056. $10.00.)

Schilpp, Paul Arthur. (Ed.). *Albert Einstein: Philosopher-Scientist.* (Evanston, Illinois: Library of Living Philosophers, Inc., 1949. Pp. xvi, 781. $8.50.) This is Volume VII of the Library of Living Philosophers.

Schlesinger, Bruno P. *Christopher Dawson and the Modern Political Crisis.* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1949. Pp. 91.) This study was the author's dissertation for the Ph.D. degree at Notre Dame which was done under the direction of Ferdinand A. Hermens.

Schmaus, Michael. *Katholische Dogmatik.* Vol. II. (Munich: Max Hueber, 1949. Pp. xvi, 962. Gebd. DM 29.80; Brosch. DM 26.80.)

Schwarztrauber, Ernest E. *The University of Wisconsin School for Workers. Its First Twenty-five Years.* (Madison: University of Wisconsin School for Workers, 1949. Pp. 40.)

Shannon, Albert Clement, O.E.S.A. *The Popes and Heresy in the Thirteenth Century.* (Villanova, Pennsylvania: Augustinian Press, 1949. Pp. ix, 148.)

Smith, Henry Nash. *Virgin Land.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950. Pp. xiv, 305. $4.50.)

Stedman, Murray S. Jr. and Susan W. *Discontent at the Polls.* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1950. Pp. x, 190. $2.75.)

Stephanou, Pelopidas Etienne, S.J. *Jean Italos. Philosophe et Humaniste.* (Rome: Pontifical Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1949. Pp. 121.)

Tannenbaum, Frank. Mexico. *The Struggle for Peace and Bread.* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1950. Pp. xiv, 293, xi. $3.50.)

Tenth Annual Report of the Archivist of the United States on the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, 1948-1949. (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1950. Pp. 12.) This phase of the activities of the National Archives is described for the first time under the aegis of the General Services Administration as part of which it now functions. Since the papers of Franklin D. Roosevelt were opened to researchers the report of the materials acquired (including that of some of his colleagues), the use made of them for research and reference, and the arrangement and finding aids established are of special interest.

Treutlein, Theodore E. (Trans.) *Pfefferkorn's Description of Sonora.* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1949. Pp. xv, 329. $9.50.)

Trevelyan, G. M. *An Autobiography and Other Essays.* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., Inc., 1949. Pp. 237. $3.00.)

Weedon, Harry. *A Pilgrim's Guide to Rome.* (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1950. Pp. xviii, 206. $2.75.)

White, Charles I. *Mother Seton, Mother of Many Daughters.* Edited by the Sisters of Charity of Mount Saint Vincent. (Garden City: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1949. Pp. xx, 300. $2.50.)

White, John Albert. *The Siberian Intervention.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950. Pp. xii, 471. $6.00.)

Wyatt, Edward A., IV. (Comp.) *Preliminary Checklist for Petersburg, 1786-1876.* (Richmond: Virginia State Library, 1949. Pp. 358. $5.00.) This is Number 9 in the Virginia Imprint Series. Careful descriptions and locations of the 636 entries issued in the ninety-one year period, accompanied by full biographical and historical notes on printers, editors, periodicals, almanacs, etc., together with a full index, make this checklist a model of its type. The entries are about double the number originally gathered for the American Imprints Inventory.